FBIS DAILY REPORT

CONTENTS

Soviet Union

Vol III No 008 *13 January 1986*

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

U.S. Tests Interceptor Missile in New Mexico AA 1
Kuznetsov Calls for Ending Nuclear Tests AA 1
[NEW TIMES No 1]
Weinberger Alleges Soviet SALT II Violations AA 6
Documents Show USSR Complying With Arms Treaties AA 6
Weinberger 'Recommends' U.S. 'Undermine' SALT II AA 7
Academicians Examine Effects of SDI, Arms Race AA 8
[MOSCOW NEWS 29 Dec]
Former U.S. Official Says SDI 'Offensive' AA 12
SDI Seen as 'Space Version of Frankenstein' [Bogachev] AA 12
International Reaction to SDI Reported AA 13
Economic Journal on SDI Failure To Curb Arms Race AA 13
New Book on Space Acitivity Urges Space Law AA 14
[Kotlyarov in KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 3 Jan]
U.S. Negotiating Position on CBW Examined [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA] AA 15

WORLD & REGIONAL ISSUES

Weekly 'International Observers Roundtable' [Gerasimov, Yefimov, Sobolev] CC 1
U.S.-Libyan Differences, Boycott Viewed CC 9
Nonaligned Forum on Monopolization of Information [Beloshapko] CC 11

UNITED STATES & CANADA

Commentary, Reportage on U.S.-Libyan Situation A 1
Shultz News Conference Cited A 1
PRAVDA on Shultz Remarks [11 Jan] A 2
Al-Qadhdhafi Assassination Proposed A 3
Reagan Interview Criticized A 4
'New Gross Attacks' by Shultz Noted A 4
Weinberger Interview Reported A 4
PRAVDA Warning on U.S. Policy A 4
'Dangerous Consequences' of U.S. Policy [Serikov] A 6
PRAVDA Cited on U.S. 'Economic War' A 7
U.S. Isolated in Anti-Libyan Campaign [Zholkver] A 7
Canada Joins 'Economic Blackmail' A 8
IZVESTIYA on 'Vituperative' Anti-Sovietism in U.S. A 8
Zorin Analyzes Reagan New Year Message A 9
Bovin Views Struggle Within U.S. on Foreign Policy A 10
Pentagon Building Up Special Purpose Troops A 11
Pentagon Involvement in U.S. Shuttle Launches Noted A 12
Senator Urges Lifting Restrictions on Equipment Sales A 12

CHINA

PRC Expresses 'Concern' Over U.S.-Libya Tension B 1
CPC Conference Examines Party Work Style [PRAVDA 12 Jan] B 1
Efforts To Improve Ties With PRC Noted B 1

NORTHEAST ASIA

Gorbachev Reply Given to Japanese Schoolgirl [KYODO] C 1
No Agreement on USSR-Japan Draft Communique [KYODO] C 1
Shevardnadze Visit to Japan 'Key Event' [Rozin] C 2
Bandura Views Soviet-Japanese Relations [IZVESTIYA 10 Jan] C 3
Soviet Nuclear Submarine Being Towed Near Japan [AFP] C 6

SOUTH ASIA

DRA Issues Statement in Support of Libya D 1
U.S. "Main Inspirer, Organizer' Against DRA [Fadeyev] D 1
'Anti-Afghan Campaign' Waged by Imperialist Forces [Shurygin in PRAVDA 11 Jan] D 2
DRA Progress Continues Under PDPA Leadership [Seyful-Mulyukov] D 3
DRA Forces' Successes Against Rebels Reported D 4

SOUTHEAST ASIA & PACIFIC

Further Reportage on Talyzin's Visit to Hanoi E 1
Meets Pham Van Dong E 1
Meets Le Duan E 1
Protocol Signed [PRAVDA 12 Jan] E 1
SRV Statement on MIA Meeting Reported E 2
Marcos Orders Investigation of CIA Interference E 2

EASTERN EUROPE

Further on Visit by SFRY's Raif Dizdarevic F 1
PRAVDA on Dinner Speeches [11 Jan] F 1
More on Cultural Agreement F 4
PRAVDA on Gromyko Talks [11 Jan] F 4
Dizdarevic Visits Uzbekistan F 5
TV Interviews Dizdarevic F 6
Comparison of Shevardnadze Talks F 6

WESTERN EUROPE

Arkhipov Arrives in Finland, Received by Koivisto G 1
Ponomarev, Zagladin Meet San Marino Party Leader G 1
TASS Notes Reaction to U.S. Sanctions on Libya G 1
UK Not To Participate G 1
Spanish Communist Party Comments G 2
Athens Demonstrations G 2
Turkish Paper Cited G 2
Austrian Statement on Middle East Policy Noted G 3
Reaction to UK Defense Secretary's Resignation G 3
IZVESTIYA Comments [11 Jan] G 3
PRAVDA Notes Resignation [11 Jan] G 4
IZVESTIYA Views Dialogue on Netherlands Missiles [Kondrashov, 10 Jan] G 4
Vorotnikov Holds Talks With French Ambassador G 6

MIDDLE EAST & NORTH AFRICA

USSR Ambassador Clarifies Policy on Libya H 1
[Tripoli Voice of Greater Arab Homeland]
Libya's Al-Turayki Cited on Soviet Support H 3
U.S. 'Massive Pressure' Against Libya Remains H 3
Islamic Countries Urge 'Active Help' for Libya [Timoshkin] H 4
Al-Qadhdhafi Defends Cause of Palestinians H 5
U.S. Policy Toward Libya 'State Terrorism' H 5
Movement on Solidarity With Libya Expanding [Lukyanov] H 6
PLO Charge D'affaire's Press Conference Reported H 7
IZVESTIYA Report [11 Jan] H 7
Envoy Informs Kuwait of Opposition to Sanctions [KUNA] H 8
Govorov Received by Kuwaiti Defense Minister H 8

SUB-SAHARAN AFRICA

Ryzhkov, Shevardnadze Meet Malagasy Officials [PRAVDA 11 Jan] J 1
Ponomarev, Mali Official Hold Conversation J 1
PRAVDA Reports New Envoy to Somalia Appointed [5 Jan] J 1

LATIN AMERICA & CARIBBEAN

Brazil Not To Support Sanctions Against Libya K 1
U.S. Gunboat Fire at Salvadoran Rebels Noted K 1
Cultural, Scientific Program Signed With Bolivia K 1

U.S. TESTS INTERCEPTOR MISSILE IN NEW MEXICO

LD111257 Moscow TASS in English 1240 GMT 11 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, January 11 TASS -- According to a report of the ASSOCIATED PRESS news agency, an interceptor missile was tested over the White Sands missile range, New Mexico, within the framework of the notorious "star wars" program. The Pentagon plans to use the weapon in a large-scale anti-missile system with space-based elements. According to a spokesman for the Army Strategic Defense Command, the missile "came within a predicted accuracy" of a target at an altitude of 4.5 kilometers. This is the fourth such test carried out by the U.S. Army. According to the ASSOCIATED PRESS, at least five more such tests are planned.

KUZNETSOV CALLS FOR ENDING NUCLEAR TESTS

PM091600 Moscow NEW TIMES in English No 1, Jan 86 pp 6-8

[Vladlen Kuznetsov article: "Will Nuclear Testing Cease?"]

[Text] The nuclear age began with the first test of the deadliest weapon ever (if we discount the theoretical and laboratory stages of its development). The test was carried out by Washington in Alamogordo, New Mexico, on July 16, 1945. Within weeks, on August 6, the Americans tried out their A-bomb in action -- on Hiroshima.

Nuclear tests do not necessarily lead to war. In the forty years since the bomb was dropped there have been no more Hiroshimas. There is no guarantee, however, that things will remain so forever. The overproduction of nuclear weapons is fraught with the threat of a holocaust. Nuclear war could break out by accident.

Tests are not carried out for testing's sake. They give the green light to improved and new-generation weapons. These weapons are tested for combat use. Test race breeds arms race, demanding ever newer experiments. How is this vicious circle to be broken?

By stopping the tests, comes the answer. No tests would mean no confidence in the efficiency of this or that weapon system and, consequently, no stimulus to produce it. And if production lines slow down, there will be fewer weapons to deploy, the arms race will lose its momentum, and the threat of war will diminish. Consequently, the stopping of weapon tests will directly affect subsequent processes connected with the production of weapons. There is a further point which certainly merits more attention than it is getting at present. If it becomes impossible to test newly invented weapons or those on the drawing boards, then research and development will make no sense at all, and the processes leading to the improvement of old weapons and the creation of new ones will then be as good as blocked.

This could be the result of stopping nuclear tests.

To end nuclear blasts would effectively mean to take a resolute step towards restricting, materially and physically, the practical possibilities for producing new-type nuclear warheads, bombs and missiles. A step which, under present circumstances, would probably be easier to agree upon than other far-reaching measures.

Seeking to reduce the threat of nuclear war, curb the arms race and consolidate and promote the progress made at the Geneva summit, the Soviet Union is now insisting on the complete banning of nuclear weapon tests for an unlimited period of time under effective international control.

Receiving Professor Bernard Lown, co-president of International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, in the Kremlin on December 18, Mikhail Gorbachev voiced the Soviet Union's readiness to extend beyond January 1, 1986, the unilateral moratorium on nuclear testing announced by the Soviet Union on August 6, 1985, the 40th anniversary of Hiroshima -- if Washington followed suit. Moscow has offered humanity a truly historic and unique opportunity to make nuclear disarmament a reality, create a reliable guarantee of preventing a global catastrophe. "It would be unreasonable, to say the least, to miss this chance which paves the way for an agreement on banning all nuclear tests for all time," the Soviet leader stressed. "Now it rests with the Government of the U.S. to decide the matter."

The civilized world wishes to see the issue satisfactorily resolved.

The UN General Assembly has just adopted a resolution on the immediate stopping and banning of all nuclear weapon tests, with only three member states -- the U.S., Britain and France -- voting against it.

"We must remember the farsightedness which led us to such achievements as the treaty on the partial banning of nuclear weapon tests signed over 20 years ago," Perez de Cuellar, the UN secretary-general, said in his report on the Organization's work in 1985. "Today the reaching of an agreement on the comprehensive banning of nuclear tests would be clear and extremely important evidence of mankind's preparedness to remove the nuclear threat."

The leaders of six states -- Argentina, Greece, India, Mexico, Tanzania and Sweden -- called upon the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. last October to stop nuclear tests altogether and usher in an era of peace and security for all mankind.

"The halting of all nuclear explosions and the concluding of a nuclear test ban treaty are priority demands of world public opinion and of the United Nations," says the statement of the World Peace Council published on July 31, 1985.

What is the nature of public feeling in the United States in this respect? The leaders of 150 peace organizations have called on the President to follow the Soviet example, describing it as "the most promising arms control development of recent years." In May 1985, the House Foreign Affairs Committee called on the administration to resume negotiations with the U.S.S.R. for the purpose of reaching an agreement on the complete banning of nuclear tests, and to submit the 1974 and 1976 Soviet-American treaties on underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes for ratification. Forty-six senators and 106 representatives urged the administration to resume talks on banning nuclear tests and described these talks as a fine way of promoting the atmosphere of cooperation which has set in after the Geneva summit.

Addressing a special arms control group of the House Armed Services Committee, William Colby, ex-director of the CIA, characterized the Soviet peace initiatives as "very substantial offers in recent months indicating a desire for a mutual ending of the arms race which is, of course, very much in their (the Russians') interest as it is in ours." William Colby believes that the best way to put an end to the arms race is simply to stop it, and he is not alone in thinking so.

It is unnessary to conduct a public opinion poll to find out what sane people the world over want -- their desires are clear. There do exist, nevertheless, individuals whose views on certain matters of principle are at variance -- to put it mildly -- with common sense and normal logic, which does not prevent them from dressing up even absurdities as pearls of wisdom beyond the reach of the "uninitiated."

Seeking to discredit the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests in the eyes of international (and American) public opinion, such experts in political chicanery assert that the unilateral moratorium on nuclear tests has cost Moscow nothing because the latter has brought its own test programme to a successful conclusion and is now working to prevent the Americans completing theirs, and this at a time when the U.S. is already finding it difficult to keep abreast of them.

Actually, it is the Soviet Union that has to keep abreast of the U.S. in all aspects of the arms race, nuclear weapon tests included. Judging from estimates of experts and competent organizations the number of nuclear tests the U.S. has carried out since 1945 is 30 percent in excess of the Soviet figure. According to the U.S. Centre for Defence Information, the U.S. certainly leads the world in this respect. So who leads the race?

Since Moscow's suspension of nuclear tests, Weashington has already carried out six. Altogether, allocations to underground nuclear tests have doubled during Reagan's presidency. Three billion dollars have been earmarked for the extension of existing nuclear weapon proving grounds and building new ones in the next few years. In May 1955, it will be recalled, the Soviet Union submitted to the UN Disarmament Commission a proposal that all states possessing atomic and hydrogen weapons should pledge themselves to stop nuclear tests. This was done despite the fact that the U.S.S.R. had carried out fewer tests than the U.S. As for the current, unilateral moratorium, Moscow cut short its test programme, without its being completed. Deciding on such a move was no easy matter, considering the scale of war preparations the U.S. and NATO in general are now engaged in. The decision shows that Moscow is guided by political considerations of principle, and concern for the future of the war-threatened world, rather than by mere arithmetric. If official Washington follows the Soviet leaders' actions with due attention it cannot fail to note that they are taking a truly innovatory and bold approach to problems of international security and are prepared to adopt far-reaching measures, unilateral ones included, to the point of self-restriction, in order to get the process of arms limitation and reduction off the ground and bring to reason those who, with the nuclear abyss yawning at their feet, are still trying to delude themselves and others with false hopes that the world's salvation lies in the "balance of fear."

Placards reading "Russia stopped testing. Why don't we?" can be seen in front of the White House today. Why, indeed? Asked when the U.S. would be able to stop nuicear tests, the President answered that he had no idea.

What they do have an idea of is why they are reluctant to stop nuclear weapon tests.

The Pentagon is planning to improve the warheads of MX, Trident, Midgetman and cruise missiles. Designers are busy developing third-generation weapons "able to focus the awesome destructive force of nuclear weapons more selectively." In the Pentagon they believe that the new miracle weapons "could be the most significant change in nuclear weapons technology since the early days of the nuclear era." Such a temptation is too strong to resist.

The arms race is being given an entirely new dimension. Competely new weapons are being developed with which to fight a nuclear war. This is all but taken for granted. "Without such research and testing," THE NEW YORK TIMES says, "there would be little confidence that the complex system of command and control would permit what Defence Secretary Caspar Weinberger has called a protracted nuclear war in which the United States could prevail."

Nuclear Shylocks are overstocked but they cannot be satiated. They say that continued testing is vital to U.S. national security, "indispensable to maintaining the credibility of our nuclear deterrent," to quote Richard Perle, Weinberger's assistant and an out-and-out hawk.

U.S. "deterrent" potential is considered inadequate, we are told. One can't help marvelling at the nerve of those who claim this. Isn't it common knowledge that the U.S. has stockpiled enough nuclear weapons to blow the world skyhigh ten times over? "Surely the Soviets know, as well as we do," Harold Evans writes in the article "The President's Chance" carried by U.S. NEWS & WORLD REPORT, "that even without further testing we have for the next 100 years enough reliable warheads to destroy their society ten times over." Knowing this is not enough. It's about time conclusions were drawn from the knowledge of harsh realities, and this knowledge translated into practical policy using the chance offered by the other side in order to guarantee, by joint effort, mutual survival rather than mutual destruction.

Both the Americans and their European allies are trying hard to convince the White House that it would be only plain common sense to take the hand extended by the Soviet Union, to make its unilateral moratorium bilateral and ultimately, universal. "If we never built, nor tested another nuclear weapon," the Centre of Defence Information explained to the President, "we would retain the clear and certain capability to annihilate the Soviet Union well into the 21st century. If that certainty will not deter a Soviet attack on the U.S. nothing will." That's true enough. Even if American weapons lose somewhat in efficiency and reliability with time, the CDI goes on, the same will be true of Soviet arms as well. In what way will mutual deterrence weaken if both sides submit to the same process?

This process of mutual restraint and curtailing preparations for war does not suit those who set the tone of all American state policy, the captains of the American military-industrial complex. This explains why the other side does not listen to reason.

At his point it is opportune to mention the principal reason for which Washington rejects the chance to stop rivalry in the development and testing of nuclear warheads and the means of their delivery. This is to be found in SDI, the "star wars" programme, a programme which, though publicized as a non-nuclear one, requires, according to THE WASHINGTON POST, the nuclear testing of an X-ray laser which is amongst its components. Edward Teller, "the father of the U.S. hydrogen bomb," is one of those who are pushing SDI the hardest. This fanatic to whom nothing seems sacred except arms is said to have talked the President into increasing allocations to a whole series of tests to be carried out in the context of the SDI programme.

Seeking to conceal the sinister purposes of experiments with nuclear arms and explain its refusal to stop them, the U.S. Administration talks about the "inadequacy" of control. This is referred to as almost the main obstacle in the way of an agreement on a mutual moratorium. This obstacle, however, is of Washington's making.

As early as March 1963, THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE MONITOR gave the lie to the argument that control was impossible. It wrote that the art of detecting nuclear blasts and distinguishing them from earthquakes had reached a point where the U.S. could calmly consent to a complete ban on nuclear weapon tests, underground ones included, and rely on its own monitoring facilities. Now, almost a quarter of a century later, this art has been further refined and brought to foolproof reliability. Many experts, American included, are unanimous that if an agreement is reached verifying its observance will be no problem at all. "Is it (the ban) policeable from outside Soviet borders?" the Baltimore SUN asks.

"Yes, say respected American seismologists, among them Jack F. Evernden, a research geophysicist with the U.S. Geological Survey who has worked on nuclear test detection since 1965." He is of the opinion that "the problem today is lack of political will, not technical incompetence."

There are over a thousand seismic stations in the world. Those belonging to the U.S. and its allies are located near Soviet borders. By virtue of their geographical location alone Washington has a much greater verification capability than Moscow. Modern equipment responds to explosions of a yield as low as one kiloton. Such are the indisputable facts.

The problem of a complete and universal banning of nuclear weapon tests is nothing new. It goes back many decades. The international community has accumulated no mean experience in dealing with the problem, and this experience is most instructive.

In 1955 the U.S.S.R. came up with its first proposal to stop testing. The proposal fell on deaf ears.

In 1958 the U.S.S.R. suspended its nuclear weapon tests from March 31, but announced their resumption on August 30, 1961. Certain quarters in Washington are not averse to speculating on this fact of postwar history: How can we trust the Russians, when they go back on their own decisions, they inquire. But the first Soviet moratorium was made conditional on the Western powers following the Soviet example. At first everything seemed to go well. The U.S. joined in on August 22, and Britain immediately afterwards. But as early as December 29, 1959, President Dwight Eisenhower said that the U.S. would consider itself free from its obligations as from December 31. France started nuclear testing in February 1960. What was the Soviet Union to do under the circumstances? Neglect its security?

If Washington fails to listen to reason today and give Moscow's good will its due, the U.S.S.R. will not waive the interests of its own security and that of its allies and friends.

On August 5, 1963, the Moscow treaty banning nuclear weapon tests in the atmosphere, outer space and under water was signed. The treaty, the signatories to which now number 113, was the first step towards the limitation of the arms race. The temporary moratorium of 1958-61 had certainly contributed to it. Another contributing factor was a unilateral moratorium of atmospheric tests announced by President Kennedy. Yes, there was a time when the U.S. ventured upon such actions, too. Kennedy set a precedent, and the lack of similar manifestations of good will is a reproach to the current administration.

In 1974-76, the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. signed two treaties, one restricting the yield of underground nuclear explosions to 150 kilotons, and the other setting this limit also for underground nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes. Both documents remain unratified, but the U.S.S.R. and the U.S.A. stick to their commitments.

In 1977-82, the U.S.S.R. , the U.S.A. and Britain entered into negotiations, on the Soviet initiative, with a view to signing a complete and universal nuclear test ban treaty. The document had been agreed upon, on the whole, by the summer of 1980. At that very moment the U.S.A. and NATO backed down. At the concluding stage the talks were cut short by the West. In July 1982, the Reagan administration refused to resume them.

Such is the background to the current Soviet moratorium. Every step along the road to a complete termination of nuclear tests was hard won. Nevertheless, the steps have been taken, which shows that a practical solution is not impossible. And the Soviet Union is now doing all it can to make further headway.

In order to heighten the effectiveness of control that Washington insists upon, the U.S.S.R. has supported the idea of using an international verification system. Six states have offered the use of their territories for monitoring the observance of a treaty on stopping nuclear tests.

The Soviet Union is prepared to go even further. If the moratorium were mutual, the two sides could agree on certain on-the-spot verification measures to remove whatever doubts might arise as to the observance of the obligations assumed.

The world is now waiting for Moscow and Washington to continue the processes initiated at the Geneva summit. Would a mutual moratorium not give weighty confirmation to the "new start" the U.S. President spoke of? Is not such a moratorium aimed at making nuclear weapons "powerless and obsolete," which is President Reagan's professed objective?

The nuclear age started with tests. It is high time they were stopped and a new age leading to a nuclear-free world was ushered in.

WEINBERGER ALLEGES SOVIET SALT II VIOLATIONS

LD122259 Moscow TASS in English 2152 GMT 12 Jan 86

[Text] New York, January 13 TASS -- U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger has made another unseemly attempt at questioning the Soviet Union's policy in the cause of observance of its international treaty obligations. Speaking in an ABC programme, he unfoundedly accused the USSR of alleged violations of the provisions of the SALT-2 treaty. The U.S. defence secretary needed all that to divert the attention of the public from the efforts being made by the administration to sabotage the treaty provisions and to justify the development and deployment of new first-strike nuclear missiles MX and Midgetman.

DOCUMENTS SHOW USSR COMPLYING WITH ARMS TREATIES

LD120557 Moscow TASS in English 0006 GMT 11 Jan 86

[Text] New York, January 10 TASS -- THE NEW YORK TIMES newspaper has reported that declassified materials of the U.S. Congress on matters of Soviet-American relations have been published in Washington. The materials were discussed at closed-door hearings last year.

Speaking in one of the Senate committees, General John T. Chain, the then director of the Bureau of Politico-Military Affairs in the State Department, said that, in the opinion of the U.S. State Department, the Soviet Union" has complied with the provisions" of all treaties and agreements on the limitation of arms. He urged the administration to observe the provisions of the Soviet-U.S. SALT-2 treaty as any attempts by the USA to violate them would only lead to a fresh spiral in the offensive nuclear arms race.

In this connection THE NEW YORK TIMES points out that the viewpoint of the State Department contradicts the stand of the Pentagon which continues to assert up to this date the USSR's non-compliance with the treaty obligations.

Particular zeal in spreading such kind of falsehoods about the Soviet Union's policy is being shown by U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger and his assistant Richard Perle who does everyting necessary to put new arms programmes through Congress and to undermine the now existing approximate strategic balance.

The newspaper writes that Perle at the selfsame hearings urged the USA to abandon the observance of the SALT-2 treaty since the treaty is ostensibly of benefit only to the Soviet Union.

The assistant to the Pentagon chief also objected to the USA's dismantling the "Poseidon" submarine after yet another "Trident" missile-carrying submarine will be phased into service. This, according to the State Department, will become a direct violation of the SALT-2 treaty. Then the Reagan administration is known to have decided, for its own considerations, to give up Perle's advice.

However, as the newspaper points out, the issue has reemerged again when it became known that a new "Trident" submarine will be launched in May as well as in the light of the on-going deployment of cruise missiles on strategic bombers. All this, the newspaper maintains, will push the United States over a treaty limit.

WEINBERGER 'RECOMMENDS' U.S. 'UNDERMINE' SALT II

LD101146 Moscow in English to North America 0001 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] While the White House has rolled up its sleeves for a bout with what they call international terrorism, Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger is working quietly but persistently to undermine the Soviet-American SALT II treaty.

A secret report by Mr Weinberger recommends violation of the SALT II treaty by not dismantling two Poseidon nuclear subs when a new Trident sub goes to sea later this year. If the Poseidons are not dismantled, the Trident's number of missile-launching tubes would put the United States over the launcher ceiling of SALT II.

To violate a U.S.-Soviet treaty there has to be some justification. Preparations for the violation began last year when the Pentagon produced a report charging the Soviet Union with various treaty violations. It is a familiar pattern, and a predictable one; in fact so predictable that serious arms control experts accuse the White House of falsifying evidence. A column to this effect appeared, though belatedly, in THE NEW YORK TIMES 5 days ago. It said in part that, in a desperate effort to have a consensus on alleged Soviet violations, the Pentagon and the White House ended up in mush. Nevertheless, armed with mush as evidence, the American secretary of defense is adament in opposing compliance with the unratified treaty.

Before the November summit in Geneva details of his letter to President Reagan became known. In that letter Caspar Weinberger was against American compliance with SALT II and against any moves that could harm the "star wars" program; but as if all this were not enough, it became known that the latest doctrine of the U.S. Navy provides for a number of things. It provides an eloquent answer to those Americans who believe their government is interested in arms control; and secondly, attacks on the treaty provide some clues as to how the public is brainwashed through the free and independent media. One honest article in THE NEW YORK TIMES calling anti-Soviet charges mush is out-numbered by thousands of statements on radio and television, speeches before various audiences, and articles in newspapers and magazines where that same mush is used as a serious argument.

ACADEMICIANS EXAMINE EFFECTS OF SDI, ARMS RACE

PM101550 Moscow MOSCOW NEWS in English 29 Dec 85 p 5

[Feature prepared by Nikolay Zaborin: "Space Age Challenge"]

[Text] A plastic cube weighing 100 grammes flies out of a device called an electromagnetic gun at a speed of over 20 kilometres per second;

The ray of a high-capacity chemical destroys the hull of a Titan ICBM;

A 6-metre-long two-stage missile, launched from a high-altitude fighter-interceptor, shoots down a satellite in orbit.

These tests have already been conducted in the USA. We may add to this the elaboration of superhigh-speed computers and their software, of special reflectors -- "rubber mirrors" -- for focussing and re-aiming a laser ray sent to orbit from the Earth, and many other "outlandish innovations". All of them are prototypes of the space weapons of the future, which advocates of the "star wars" programme (officially known as the "Strategic Defence Initiative") intend to produce in the USA.

What can the SDI bring the world? Will it make nuclear weapons obsolete, or will it give a fresh impetus to the arms race? What, in general, are the fundamental principles for guaranteeing international security in our time? A number of prominent Soviet specialists expressed their views on these problems at a press conference in Moscow.

Georgiy Arbatov, academician, director of the Institute of US and Canada Studies, USSR Academy of Sciences:

Not only different stands on the limitation of these or other types of weapons, or on regional questions, but also two different, and, I'd say, opposite concepts of security clashed at the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva.

The main components of the Soviet concept are as follows:

Security can be only mutual if we speak about the USSR and the USA; and if we have the entire international community in mind -- then it can be only universal. We cannot work for security to the detriment or against the security of this or that side, but only work together. The lack of a feeling of security by the other side leads to nervousness, to unpredictability of its action, and, therefore, offers a threat to yourself.

Security cannot be based ad infinitum on terror, or on "unacceptable retaliation," or, as it is sometimes said, on a balance of terror, deterrence or containment. This only steps up the arms race -- one has to arms oneself all the time in order to scare the other side. In such a case the arms race gets out of control far beyond the limits of everything reasonable in the field of mutual deterrence.

Granted the present level of development of the means of destruction, security cannot be guaranteed by military-technical means. This is a political matter and can be dealt with only by political means. This calls, above all, for a political will to stop the arms race, which has become the main threat in the nuclear age, and to start on the trek back -- towards disarmament. But there is also a more substantial, more long-term task -- with all the differences between the two countries, we must learn to live with one another on earth, and to live in a civilized manner, without excesses of rhetoric, by taking the interests of each other into account, and in conditions of developing mutually advantageous cooperation.

The time factor has become critical. Political activities cannot be postponed to the future, they are needed now, at once. If it were possible, they were needed even yesterday!

It is already extremely hard for us to negotiate with the USA because instability has grown and, with it, suspicions and mutual distrust. The continuation of the arms race and the emergence of new weapons systems make dialogue and, even more so, the achievement of accords even more difficult, if not impossible.

The second reason is that scientific-technological progress in military affairs is steadily reducing the time and the opportunities for adopting political decisions on problems of war and peace and transfers these questions to computers, which creates a colossal threat. Just one example: the flight time to target of Pershing-2 missiles of 7-9 minutes, coupled with the "decapitation theory," leaves absolutely no time for making any sort of decisions in an emergency situation.

The USSR and the USA have only 10 percent of the world's population. Our is a complicated, interconnected and interdependent world of many dozens of states and nations. Each one of them has its own vital, quite legitimate interests. Each country is an independent subject in international relations. And our world is in a state of constant change, because no one can guarantee an eternal "status quo."

An absolutely new situation has taken shape, which signifies the rejection of the old way of thinking of behaviour, which had been taking shape for ages, even for millennia. We realize how difficult it is to grasp these new realities and to restructure radically, in keeping with them, the entire system of international relations. But mankind's survival will not be guaranteed if this problem is not solved. We are trying to bring our political thinking into accord with these realities, without declaring that we have already completely solved this problem. And we invite all the other states to take part in this major work.

Unfortunately, in Geneva we came up against another concept, based on the attempt made to guarantee security with the aid of force, military-technical means or some sort of a "technical trick." The key element in this are the "star wars" which have nothing in common whatsoever with defence.

Eseentially there exists not one SDI but a whole set of SDIs. There is President Reagan's SDI -- a dream, nearly a religious dream of an absolutely impregnable shield which would make nuclear weapons powerless. For Weinberger, the defence secretary, and many others the SDI is nothing else but an opportunity to torpedo the existing agreements, talks and the very process of arms limitations. For some generals the SDI is a limited shield, but in that case it is nothing else but a component for securing a first strike capability. Some others regard the SDI as a tool for drawing the USSR into a new ruinous round of the arms race so as to try to bleed it economically. The SDI version for the military-industrial complex is money. And true enough, the published data tells us that, granted the present state of affairs, the military allocations on nuclear weapons and means of their delivery will reach their peak in the next 4 years, whereas the SDI promises 30 years of huge, steady orders.

We fear not the threat created by the SDI, but that which should be feared in the USA, in Europe and everywhere else -- the situation of a complete strategic chaos, of an unlimited arms race. All that can bring the nuclear war nearer. This is what everyone should fear, including the Americans and their allies, who, under the pretext of Atlantic solidarity, are trying to escape responsibility for the vitally important political decisions on the destinies of peace and their own nation.

Yevgeniy Velikhov, academician, vice-president, USSR Academy of Sciences:

An important moment of the Geneva summit is that the sides, as they confirmed it in their accords, will not be seeking for the means to build up a strategic superiority. This is a recognition of the state in which both countries are now -- the state of nuclear parity. The efforts applied by the present-day U.S. Administration in the first half of its term to develop numerically and qualitatively its means of nuclear attack, failed, as we can see it today, to produce the results it desired. The parity will be maintained -- the world can no longer get out of it. However, the greatest paradox of all in these conditions is that the most powerful weapons ever devised by man cannot be used either as a means of politics or a means of warfare. The reluctance of certain circles of people to recognize this fact is the cause of many problems that arise today.

Such an element as stability is inherent in parity itself. The development of new types of nuclear weapons capable of accurately hitting small and protected targets (Pershing-2, cruise missiles, submarine-launched D-5 missiles, etc.) leads to a considerable reduction in the stability of parity, even though, on the whole, it is preserved. This is fraught with many dangers and the realization of this fact leads to two conclusions -- the need to end the qualitative improvement of nuclear arms and the need for their reduction.

Why are we taking such a principled stand on the question of space arms? Above all, because this problem goes beyond the realm of antimissile defence. Space arms, the same as nuclear arms -- are global weapons. To remind the reader, the well-known research paper of scientists on the so-called nuclear winter shows that no matter where a nuclear war may flare up, every earth person will be affected by its catastrophic consequences in one way or another. The same is happening with space arms -- no matter what weapon is orbited, it cannot be suspended or kept in one place. The weapons systems will be revolving around the globe and the entire near-earth space will have to be saturated by them so that they could be used against missiles, land-based targets, aircraft, etc.

Another danger is in that an attack weapon can be distinguished from a defence weapon only after it has been used. It is very hard to differentiate them technologically, the more so that small modifications may change the nature of the use of this or that system.

But still, what will, after all, happen if an attempt (a hopeless one, in my opinion) will be made to get outside the limits of strategic parity? The analyses made both by our and Western scientists show that the space echelons would be extremely vulnerable and, essentially, defenceless, because it is so very easy to destroy a space station, the same as any other sophisticated system. The building up of means of counteraction can be quite effective especially from the point of view of the cost. A U.S. research paper said that the cost of a hypothetical space station and an antimissile with a single warhead and a very short flight time to target differs by a factor of 10 to the power of 2 i.e. by 100 times! The task of strengthening security with the aid of the SDI is an illusion.

It is crucial that all people realize that we are today at a critical stage of human history. The weapons systems are becoming extremely sophisticated and their further development will make the process of their limitation, which was not adquately effective to begin with, effective in general.

Roald Sagdecev, academician, director of the Institute of Space Research, USSR Academy of Sciences:

When we were confronted with the practical change in the U.S. strategic doctrine, even though it was not based on detailed or serious scientific arguments, but on the vision of a single person or a group of people, or a dream, we, naturally, were forced to get together sizeable research forces to make a serious analysis of the scenarios in which the SDI begins to intermingle with the nuclear deterrent forces -- the main-stay of the strategic balance of our time.

We considered, above all, the technical components of the SDI system -- the interceptor-missiles -- land-based or installed on large space platforms, the so-called combat stations -- the types of weapons that are to utilize superpowerful laser systems, particle accelerators and the so-called electromagnetic guns. These calculations, the same as the assessments by foreign scientists, including those who worked for military science, lead us to the conclusion that the SDI is an extremely fanciful, vulnerable and costly programme, which cannot create an absolute shield.

According to the SDI creators, it will be able to repulse only 80 or a maximum of 90 percent of enemy intercontinental missiles. Whereas a mere 1 percent of the ICBMs from each side can today carry approximately up to 100 warheads, with a yield equivalent to about 5,000 Hiroshimas. This alone shows that the defence forces are incapable of changing the existing strategic balance. In real life, however, we should take into account also other components, particularly the medium-range missiles which, as a rule, have a flatter trajectory and the cruise missiles against which the SDI doesn't offer any method of defence. But if your space shield is full of holes, isn't it more enticing to deliver the first strike so that your hole-ridden shield could at least stop the weakened retaliatory blow of the other side?

Space weapons will bring one more type of instability. According to our estimates, it happens that a mere 0.1 per cent of the SDI's fire power, intended, supposedly to shoot down missiles, is enough to destroy at one go its twin -- the SDI system of the other side. After which it all begins at the beginning again.

Naturally, when faced with the possible change in the enemy's strategic doctrine, one has to choose a way which would be in accord with conditions of strategic stability with the aid of minimum economic investment. As it happens, the method based on countermeasures conforms to these conditions. Today already several dozen such countermeasures apparently exist. They presuppose the imparting to the strategic retaliatory forces additional stability, durability, maneuverability, and make them more quickly deployable, so that the hypothetical "star wars," about which some shortsighted politicians are dreaming, if it should happen (and it will last 2-3 minutes), would pose very complex problems to the side which would wish to hide behind the star shield after delivering the first strike.

When putting forward their concept, the "star wars" advocates expect to arouse the layman's imagination so as to persuade him that the nuclear genie that had been released from the bottle in 1945 in Hiroshima, can be chased back into the bottle by the efforts of scientists. But science can only study nature's fundamental laws and not violate them. Would it not be better to channel the forces of scientists, including the U.S. technical genius, which we respect very much, into another direction? Then science would be able to yield real fruit to humanity in the struggle against hunger, in dealing with the ecological and other global problems and in learning the secrets of the universe. ([Sagdeyev ends])

[Zaborin] Reason and political will are the means which can really render nuclear weapons unnecessary and powerless, guarantee international security and the conditions for further development. The press conference hosts declared that 1986, with its new talks and meetings, will be decisive in determining the road along which humanity will make progress.

FORMER U.S. OFFICIAL SAYS SDI 'OFFENSIVE'

LD101242 Moscow TASS in English 0842 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] New York, January 10 TASS -- The aim of the "star wars" programme is to create offensive, not defensive weapons as the Reagan administration seeks to convince the American public by deception, said retired Lieutenant-Colonel Robert Bowman, director of the Washington Institute for Space and Security Studies, former senior official of the U.S. Department for the Air Force. In an interview to the newspaper "PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE" he emphasized that the Strategic Defence Initiative signified a fresh escalation of the arms race.

SDI SEEN AS 'SPACE VERSION OF FRANKENSTEIN'

LD112116 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Vladimir Bogachev commentary]

[Text] A new round in the Soviet-American nuclear and space arms talks begins in Geneva next (?Thursday). A commentary from our observer of military affairs, Vladimir Bogachev:

This round of talks is the first one after the summit meeting, and that (?instills) hope because the leaders of the two countries reached important accords. The objective of the talks was reaffirmed and it lies in working out and concluding agreements to prevent an arms race in space and to stop it on earth. It was decided to speed up the work (?of) these talks. It is also important that there lie on the negotiating table Soviet proposals on a 50-percent reduction of nuclear weapons of the Soviet Union and the United States that can reach each other's territory. However, progress at the talks is possible only provided there is a full ban on strike space weapons or, in other words, if the "star wars" program is renounced.

Why is this so? The point is, action on this program would bring about strategic chaos, with the arms race getting out of control. As work continues in the United States on the SDI project, as the development of space arms is officially called, the danger the project presents becomes more and more obvious. Even the project leaders themselves now admit it is far from a defensive one. For example, the director of a section to organize the implementation of the SDI project, John Gardner, said that the implementation of the project would sharply tip the nuclear balance in favor of the United States. At the same time, the official didn't give any promises that the SDI could be reliable as a means of defense. A former presidential aide, George Keyworth, said the "star wars" program provided for the creation of a lid over the Soviet Union instead of a shield over America. Apparently, this means the deploymentof attack space weapons over Soviet territory to hit targets on the ground. The SDI is not a means of defense, but an instrument of aggression. If American arms are sited in terrestrial space the Soviet Union will find effective means to counterbalance them and that response will be both quick and less expensive than the American program.

A highly dangerous aspect of the American "star wars" system lies in the fact that the vast number of computers used in it can take decisions, by-passing people.

These intricate computers may develop faults which will be hard to spot. Even a small fault in a nuclear activated space laser could bring about irrevocable consequences. The SDI may well prove to be the space version of Frankenstein, an invention that killed the man that made it. The summit meeting in Geneva showed that accords reached earlier between the Soviet Union and the United States about the subject and objectives of the talks is the basis for drafting mutually acceptable agreements. A radical cut in nuclear arsenals can be achieved only if the "star wars" program is renounced.

INTERNATIONAL REACTION TO SDI REPORTED

LD110005 Moscow TASS in English 2358 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, January 10 TASS -- The United States is seeking more active participation of its allies in the realisation of the "star wars" programme. According to informed observers, during the talks between U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger and Shintaro Abe, Japanese minister of foreign affairs who had arrived here for an official visit, the Pentagon chief insisted that the Japanese Government take an official decision on joining the space militarisation plans. The press reports that Japan has already expressed appreciation of the U.S. Administration's so-called "Strategic Defence Initiative" (SDI) and is now studying the question of her possible role in implementing the programme. Other matters aimed at broadening military and political cooperation between Japan and the United States were also discussed at the talks.

New York, January 10 TASS -- Robert Bowman, former director of the space program of the U.S. Air Force, president of the Institute for Space and Security Studies, has stated that the purpose of the "star wars" programme is to create offensive weapons, and not defensive ones, as the Reagan administration is trying deceitfully to convince the U.S. public. In an interview with the newspaper PITTSBURGH POST-GAZETTE, he emphasized that deployment of space arms by the United States would put in jeopardy the USSR's security. It is obvious that the Soviet Union will make every effort to prevent military superiority over itself. Bowman pointed out that this is why the SDI signifies a new escalation of the arms race and the creation of new types of weapons.

Bonn, January 10 TASS -- When Chancellor Helmut Kohl advertises the U.S. "Strategic Defense Initiative" (SDI) and presses for the participation of the FRG's companies in it, he refers to a certain "side benefit" of appropriate research to technological progress for the peaceful purposes, writes the influential STERN magazine. However, the chancellor deeply errs. Non-military uses of the SDI's results are a myth which has little in common with reality. The magazine reports that on an assignment of the Ministry for Scientific Research and Technology of the FRG, a study was carried out with a view to finding out whether work under the "star wars" programme can be of benefit to the development of advanced technology for civilian purposes. Prominent experts have analysed more than 600 materials, predominantly U.S. ones. A conclusion which the specialists have arrived at disproved the propaganda thesis of the "star wars" advocates: the SDI programme cannot be justified from the viewpoint of politics and the research tasks of the civilian sector.

ECONOMIC JOURNAL ON SDI FAILURE TO CURB ARMS RACE

LD130956 Moscow TASS in English 0920 GMT 13 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 13 TASS -- Stubbornly going ahead with their "Strategic Defense Initiative", its authors and advocates are trying to prove that strategic stability can be strengthened in this way and that nuclear weapons will eventually be abolished altogether, the journal "MIROVAYA EKONOMIKA I MEZHDUNARODYNE OTNOSHENIYA" (World Economy and International Relations) says in its first issue in 1986.

But no reductions in let alone abolition of nuclear weapons can be thought about seriously with such a "scenario". It is a scenario for the endless continuation and escalation of the arms race rather than for its termination.

The dramatic growth of the arms arsenals, huge as they are, would have the worst possible effect on strategic stability and therefore on the mutual security of the sides and on the world situation as a whole.

The concept of the development space strike systems, advertised as defensive, can not be considered in isolation from the other U.S. war preparations, aimed at achieving the ability to deliver a disarming first strike. The "Strategic Defence Initiative" has been integrated into a comprehensive complex of major U.S. arms buildup programmes. The plans to develop anti-missile defences do not abrogate the "strategic programme" pursued by the U.S. Administration but merely complement and enhance it.

The development and deployment of partially space-based ABM defences is intended to provide conditions for the USA to attack the Soviet Union with impunity, using the entire range of offensive nuclear weapons. Mankind is facing the threat of another wave of arms race, this time with nuclear space weapons, the journal says.

NEW BOOK ON SPACE ACTIVITY URGES SPACE LAW

PM091537 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 3 Jan 86 Second Edition p 3

[Review by Candidate of Juridical Sciences Colonel of Justice I. Kotlyarov: "Danger to Mankind"]

[Text] Man's space activity is increasing yearly. It is entering the life of more and more countries and peoples. The global nature of this activity and of its consequences dictates the need for space activity to be regularized in international law and for efforts to be pooled with a view to preventing the militarization of space and stopping it from being turned into a source of deadly danger to all mankind. The militarization of space would mean a qualitatively new stage in the arms race.

However, the United States continues to insist on implementing its "star wars" program and has not abandoned its attempts to turn space into a bridgehead for war. The exposure of the aggressive U.S. plans to militarize space and of the danger they pose to civilization is the central problem in the recently published book "International Space Law" ["Mezhdunarodnoye kosmicheskoye pravo," International Relations Publishing House, Moscow, 1985, 208 pages, price 80 kopeks], prepared by an authors collective of Soviet international jurists -- I.P. Blishchenko, B.S. Vereshchetin, Yu. M. Kolosov, and A.S. Piradov.

Because of its aggressive nature, the authors emphasize, imperialism uses scientific and technical progress to create increasingly sophisticated types of weapons. And space rocket technology is no exception. This line shows up particularly in the activity of the United States, which has always viewed space as some kind of "absolute position" whose capture will enable it to rule the world.

The directive on national space policy for the next decade, which President Reagan signed 4 July 1982, lays special emphasis on space exploration for military purposes. Developing that directive, on 23 March 1983 the United States proclaimed the "star wars" program, which is extremely dangerous for the destiny of peace. The program provides for the creation [sozdaniye] and deployment of a large-scale ABM system with space-based elements, which is banned by the 1972 ABM Treaty.

The book covers the chief international legal problems concerning the use of space. At the same time the authors set forth in a quite detailed and convincing manner the Soviet program of peaceful space exploration. The essence of Soviet policy is to outlaw the militarization of space.

The book is of interest not only to students of problems of international space law but also to a wide circle of readers.

U.S. NEGOTIATING POSITION ON CBW EXAMINED

LD090745 Moscow TASS in English 0714 GMT 9 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow, January 9 TASS-- "At the meeting at Geneva the leaders of the USSR and the USA reaffirmed their striving to deliver mankind from barbarous weapons and stated that they intended to lend a fresh impetus to the negotiations being conducted on that matter", writes the newspaper "KRASNAYA ZVEZDA".

For the Soviet Union this is the natural continuation of its course. It is to be recalled that as of the mid-1940s the USSR has repeatedly submitted proposals on prohibition of chemical weapons. The task of working for an end to production of chemical weapons, liquidation of chemical weapons has also been formulated in the draft new edition of the programme of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

Unfortunately, Washington is now demonstrating a different approach. Obviously contrary to the Geneva spirit, the U.S. Congress approved the production of a new variety of chemical weapons -- binary".

"The American draft convention, which is to this day the mainstay of the U.S. stance, is known to have been read out at the Geneva conference on disarmament in 1984", the newspaper recalls.

Nearly the greater part of the U.S. draft is devoted to problems of control", the article runs. "And it turns out here that the United States advocates control only of enterprises which are under the government's authority.

Meanwhile, the bulk of the enterprises capable of producing chemical weapons in the United States and other NATO member-countries belong to private firms, which, according to the American approach, are beyond any control".

"The Soviet leadership repeatedly stated that it is interested in control to no lesser extent than other governments and counts, above all, on its national means of control", the newspaper stresses. "The Soviet Union is calling upon other countries for that. Meeting halfway the wishes of partners in negotiations, the Soviet Union has given consent in principle to application of some reasonable international control procedures".

"But the United States continues insisting on terms of agreement, which are beforehand unacceptable and which lead to violation of sovereign rights of the convention member-countries. Such an approach may lead the negotiations into a blind alley".

WEEKLY 'INTERNATIONAL OBSERVERS ROUNDTABLE'

ID122026 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 12 Jan 86

["International Observers' Roundtable" program with Gennadiy Ivanovich Gerasimov, chief editor of MOSKOVSKOYE NOVOSTI; Nikolay Ivanovich Yefimov, first deputy chief editor of IZVESTIYA; and Vitaliy Sergeyevich Sobolev, All-Union Radio commentator]

[Text] [Sobolev] Hello, comrades. Well, we have gotten used to the fact that we are already living in 1986. The United Nations has declared this year to be a year of peace, and there is no doubt that the overwhelming majority of people want it to be just that. In addition to the desires, there are real prerequisites which have been set down, in particular during the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva. Stanley Hoffmann, an eminent U.S. writer and political scientist is currently giving his thoughts in this connection in the press. He writes: The choice is close to hand. On the one hand, there is an opportunity to conclude the first agreement for a radical reduction in nuclear armaments. The price for reaching that kind of an agreement would be the rejection of the wild and dangerous prospects that are linked with the SDI. It would bring additional benefits in the (?shape) of improved relations between the great powers. On the other hand, there is the possibility of bringing about an unrestrained and death-dealing arms race and a deterioration in the political climate, not just between Moscow and Washington, but between the United States and its allies, which fear the ultimate strategic and political consequences of the "star wars" program. Will the positive process in Soviet-U.S. relations that was mapped out at the Geneva summit meeting be developed, Hoffmann asks; or will the monster of the SDI, as it is called, be allowed to frustrate this process? Well, many people are asking this kind of question, and, as we see, they are also doing so in the United States. As far as an answer is concerned, well, the Soviet-U.S. talks on nuclear and space armaments are due to be resumed in the very near future. Evidently, something will begin to become clear then.

UN "Year of Peace"

[Gerasimov] But I do not think that any of the diplomats who voted in favor of the relevant UN General Assembly resolution on 24 October last year -- the resolution that declared this year to be International Peace Year -- I do not think that any of these diplomats was so naive as to expect that 1986 will become a year of peace by itself just by virtue of a heartfelt resolution. Accordingly, the report by the UN secretary general on this subject also put it like this: Although 1986 will possibly not become a year of peace throughout the world, it must become a year of struggle for peace. The Soviet Union met Peace Year by repeating its call to the United States to follow our good example and end all nuclear tests. Our country proposed a concrete goal: that all states and all peoples act in such a way as to make 1986 go down in history as the year of the decline of nuclear explosions. According to data from the Swedish Institute for Defense Research, since Hiroshima, the beginning of the nuclear era, about 1,600 nuclear explosions have been carried out. Of these, about 800 represent the U.S. share, and about 600 represent the share that we have been obliged to carry out. We are willing to close the account, to rule it off, to give up arithmetical parity and perhaps the cognition of some nuances revealed by the U.S. opponents around about the 750th explosion. But the United States is not willing to close off the count, because, you see, it has to study the nuclear reactor for the X-ray laser for "star wars" weapons; and it also turns out, because even with this start, amounting to 200 explosions, it supposedly has to catch up the Soviet Union in modernizing its nuclear arsenal, whereas in actual fact it is simply a question of seeking a way to obtain military superiority.

[Yefimov] The U.S. is not willing to take that kind of step now. This position that the U.S. has taken up was expressed very figuratively by one U.S. journalist, who said that Washington's position on the issue of halting nuclear tests was reminiscent of the prayer by the young St. Augustine, if the legend is to be believed: Deliver me, O Lord, from all sin, St. Augustine prayed, but Lord, do not grant the deliverance yet.

[Sobolev] When speaking about things that are happening at the start of the year, one unfortunately must draw attention to the following manifestation which does not conform to the Geneva spirit: In Western countries, primarily in the United States, they are continuing to whip up blind anti-Sovietism, hatred for everything that is Soviet no matter what the grounds for doing so and without any grounds. Engaged in this are powerful means for influencing the masses, such as television and the cinema, where Soviet people are depicted as kinds of monsters. In the press, too, and in political circles, including those at the highest level, the human rights topic or the regional conflicts topic -- in particular the situation surrounding Afghanistan -- are being used for the same purpose. What is more, the head of the U.S. Administration is also taking part in this.

[Gerasimov] Anti-Sovietism has now even entered the advertising field. And what is more, it has done so in quite a different way from what used to be the case. I remember that in the past, one could see quite often on U.S. television an advertisement for yogurt which our Abhazians used, saying that the reason they live such long lives is that they eat yogurt made by the Dannon company. Of course that was not quite true: Yet they did live long lives and they did eat yogurt, but it certainly was not Dannon's yogurt, but their own brand. At any rate, there was some distortion here, but a very innocent distortion, I would say.

[Yefimov] Currently, all three U.S. television stations, the three main stations, have been showing an advertisement featuring a fashion show in Russia. In it, a truly hideous and ugly woman, really repulsive -- the part is played by a man -- makes three appearances in front of a somewhat stupid audience, primitive looking types, too. The advertisement has been made for the Wendy's company, which sells sandwiches in the United States. That is the way they depict Russians and the Soviet Union.

[Gerasimov] This is a very dangerous tendency: it creates anti-Russian and anti-Soviet stereotypes in the mind of the man in the street.

[Yefimov] According to a poll that was carried out not all that long ago in THE NEW YORK TIMES, 44 percent of Americans do not know that the Soviet Union and the United States were allies during WWII, and 28 percent believe that we were fighting against each other. It seems to me that the opportunity for a thaw, the possibility for an improvement in Soviet-U.S. relations and in the international climate as a whole -- it seems to me that this possibility has frightened some people badly in the United States, including some at the very highest levels of power.

[Sobolev] The fact is that it was at the Geneva meeting that an understanding was reached about finding ways for our peoples to get to know each other better. This is where drawing closer together and realizing the truth about each other begins.

[Yefimov] Nevertheless...

[Gerasimov interrupts] At any rate, it seems to me that they have overlooked the arrival of Peace Year in Washington, if one is to judge not just by the position on nuclear explosions, but also by the fact that the year has started in a way that is certainly not peaceful. It has begun with very serious events taking place around Libya.

U.S. Anti-Libyan Stance

[Yefimov] The British have an expression: There is method to every madness; and the Americans also have their method. What happened in the Libya affair? On the eve of the New Year, on 27 December, unknown persons carried out raids at the international airports in Rome and Vienna. Nineteen people, including a child, died, most of them in Vienna. It was murder -- senseless, cruel, totally unjustified murder -- and what could have justified it? One hardly needs to explain our country's attitude toward acts of terrorism. We have always condemned them and will continue to condemn them. Who, then, committed the murders? Up to now the Austrian authorities -- and it is they who are now carrying out the investigation -- up to now they are unable to say who is behind the terrorists and who the terrorists were. For example, 2 days ago the Austrian minister for the interior denied reports that the members of the terrorist group which had carried out the armed raid had come from Libya. The minister stated at a press conference that Austria has no proof at all that those involved in the attack received support in any form from the Libyan authorities; so far there is no proof.

[Sobolev] Libya denies these accusations. It officially condemns these terrorist acts.

[Yefimov] Yes. But how did the United States react? The last shots had scarcely rung out in these airports when Washington immediately declared that Libya was guilty. It is clear that Libya bears the responsibility for the attacks on the airports, the U.S. President said. You will ask: What proof did the U.S. President give? None at all. The U.S. President stated that he cannot reveal the proof. But as Rustaveli wrote, you can only get out of the jug what is in it, and this jug is empty. McFarlane, Reagan's former assistant, who still appears frequently on U.S. television, made an appearance in connection with the Libyan events. Do you have any proof that Libya is a party to the raids, the program presenter asked him? I have no proof at all, he replied, but I feel that Libya's guilt is beyond doubt. There is no proof, yet they go on accusing Libya. If that is what Washington considers, then that is what it has to be. That is the Washington logic. Washington immediately picked up the big stick. There are 40 U.S. warships now concentrated off the Libyan coast. Day after day without a break, as the President was on holiday in California, the chiefs of staff committee of that country selected targets for bombing strikes ranging from Libya's antiaircraft batteries to oil refineries. The aggressionhas not yet been carried out; not yet. But, economic agression has already been announced. The U.S. President issued an order which has banned U.S. firms from selling anything to Libya and from buying anything from that country. He has ordered all Americans living and working in Libya -- and there are about 1,500 of them there -- to leave that country by 1 February. If they fail to obey, they are threatened with criminal prosecution, fines, and prison...

[Gerasimov interrupts] Up to 10 years...

[Yefimov] All Libyan deposits in the American banks and their departments abroad have been frozen. Washington has appealed to its NATO allies to do the same. The U.S. allies...

[Gerasimov, interrups] ...refused.

[Yefimov] ...refused.

[Gerasimov] Let us come back to the military threats for the time being. First, why does the United States suddenly act as some sort of self-appointed judge?

It has to determine something, to punish someone, find someone guilty. What we have here is some sort of a lynch law in the international arena. But all these military threats appear to be, at least for the time being, a bluff. Why is that? Well, I believe that it is primarily because they fear a close encounter with the Libyan air defense. Apart from that, there are foreign specialists working in Libya: 15,000 Italians, 5,000 British, 1,500 French, and the same number of Germans from the FRG, and about 1,500 Americans themselves. Although as far as the last group is concerned, the President has ordered them to return; but he cannot order the Italians to go home.

[Sobolev] And the Americans are, as one can judge from their declarations in the press, not intending to comply with that.

[Gerasimov] The Americans, are afraid, naturally. The British daily THE GUARDIAN for instance, wrote that the Americans who live in Libya believe that they have nothing to fear from the Libyans. But to make up for it, they are worried over punitive measures by the President if they do not leave in compliance with the President's instructions. After all, 10 years in jail is 10 years in jail, for disobedience. But then there was also an interview in the papers with an American from Texas who works in Libya. This is what he said: What could I go back to? With my high qualifications I would not be able to find a job at the oil fields at home. So, this is also the kind of problem they can have.

[Sobolev] Gennadiy Ivanovich, but one should say that the threat of a military attack against Libya is still there. In any case, some Washington officials do not exclude the possibility of a military attack in the future. This is being regarded...

[Gerasimov interrupts] That is because the policy of threats is being continued. Let us see what happens in February. They have ostensibly declared a respite now, they say, until February, although they have some plans, naturally.

[Yefimov] Not just a respite; they are now sending their emissaries to Europe, who are to exert pressure on their allies.

[Gerasimov] The allies do not support the economic sanctions. Bonn is against, London is against.

[Yefimov interrupts] But nevertheless...

[Gerasimov interrupts] And naturally, they do not support a military action.

[Yefimov] Nevertheless, the U.S. television company NBC reported at the end of the week that U.S. Secretary of State Shultz said off the record: West Europe is given a choice either to support the economic and diplomatic sanctions, or, in the future -- the indefinite future as yet -- to accept an armed intervention by the United States in Libya. It looks as if, to be on the safe side, they are preparing public opinion for the possibility of such an aggression.

[Gerasimov] William Safire, who is a quite well-known observer, writes the following: Our allies should be taught a lesson. For example, the Italians refuse to support us, but let us consider it: Italians receive $800 million in revenue from U.S. tourism and $600 million from the sale of Italian shoes in the United States. So, let us deprive them of these opportunities, tourism and their shoe sales; let us punish them. In the very same way, let us hit Volkswagen -- this is a West German car firm. So, he calls for economic sanctions against the U.S. allies themselves.

I think that one (Joseph Turba) a former foreign policy adviser of President Reagan himself, is right: Analyzing the situation which has shaped up regarding Libya, he assessed Reagan's line in the following way: It is an ill-conceived, inconsistent, and mad policy. Retired Admiral Eugene Carroll, who now works in the well-known Center for Defense Information in Washington, emphasizes the following: Look, we act ostensibly as the leader of the free world, but we have no one to lead. We are now similar to that lieutenant who jumped out of his trench and ordered an attack, but the soldiers stayed in the trench and did not stir; that is the European allies. What kind of leader are we if no one aligns himself with us? So, in general, he says, we appear in this story as perfect fools. Yes, excuse me, this was what he said.

[Sobolev] U.S. television even made such a conclusion: It appears, at least for the time being, that it is not Al-Qadhdhafi, not Libya, but President Reagan who has found himself in isolation.

[Gerasimov] The result for the time being appears to be a boomerang, because at present the Libyan people has closed its ranks around Al-Qadhdhafi even more, and this is absolutely natural, for it has closed its ranks in the face of a threat from abroad; and the Arabic world did so as well, although it is far from being homogenous.

[Yefimov] Another, more decisive resolution in support of Libya was just adopted at the conference of Muslim countries in Fes. It condemns all U.S. measures against Libya, confirms unreserved solidarity with Libya, contains appeals to the United States for an immediate repeal of sanctions, and an appeal to all Muslim countries to counteract the U.S. measures.

U.S. 'Double Standards'

I would like to dwell on two more questions. The events around Libya have yet again showed the double standards of the morals of the Washington politicians, their inability to assess soberly what is really going on in the world. It cost them nothing to accuse another state of showing indulgence toward terrorists, to make accusations without producing any proof. At the same time, they themselves are to blame for many very serious sins.

[Gerasimov] I would like to make a remark: First, three times over the past year and a half, as the press reports, Libya sent messages through some mediary appealing for a dialogue with Washington. Not a squeak in response, as they say. And second, the U.S. Marines have a combat anthem, such a militant song, which starts with the line: From the halls of Montezuma to the shores of Tripoli. Well, Montezuma is in Mexico, but Tripoli is Tripoli and this song is very old. It appears that as early as in the last century, the United States entered Tripoli with a sword in hand, although at that time they failed at it.

[Yefimov] I would like to explore further the thought of moral double standards. Hardly any listener has forgotten about the deaths, not of 19 people, but of thousands in the Palestinian camps of Sabra and Shatila several years ago. The perpetrators of this massacre are known; Tel Aviv even had to send one of them into retirement. Did the White House send its fleet to the Israeli shore when it happened?

[Sobolev interrupts] And Israel has downed a Libyan passenger plane over the Sinai Peninsula.

[All speak at once] ...the Libyan passenger plane.

[Yefimov] Has the White House announced any sanctions against it? No. So what kind of moral is this?

[Gerasimov] And when Israel dealt a terrorist blow to Tunis recently.

[Sovolev] The United States simply supported this blow; they helped it.

[Yefimov] I also would like to stress this: The anti-Libyan hysteria is assuming wild, simply primitive forms in the United States. Two days ago, in an interview given to a U.S. television company, Senator Metzenbaum -- I emphasize, a senator -- suggested staging an attempt on Al-Qadhdhafi's life and to assassinating him. We have reached such a stage, he declared, when Al-Qadhdhafi should be removed.

[Sobolev] There was some infomation in the press concerning the fact that the CIA did prepare an attempt on Al-Qadhdhafi's life, as well as on the life of other political leaders of the developing countries who do not suit the United States.

[Yefimov] There was. THE WASHINGTON POST in the past few days has reported a plan to overthrow the Tripoli government. This plan was ratified by the head of the White House, and it envisaged applying all measures, including murder, to the leader of the Libyan revolution. What was Washington's reaction when this paper published this particular plan? Washington decided to find and punish those who allowed this information to find its way to the press.

U.S. 'Neoglobalism'

[Sobolev] I would like to dwell once more on the fact that the United States is trying hard to involve at least West Europe and Japan in its anti-Libyan crusade, to endow it with a global nature. The term global has the same root as the word globe, which represents the globe of earth. At present, if one should believe official Washington sources, U.S. foreign policy rests upon the concept of neo-globalism, that is new globalism. It was once said in Britain that the sun never sets on the British Empire; now, in the opinion of U.S. leaders, it never sets on the spheres of U.S. vital interests. Whatever happens, and wherever it happens, the United States is allowed to resort to any means in order to obstruct the undesirable changes. Such is Washington's starting position when it considers any regional problem. Strictly speaking, it is not from today that the Washington politicians conduct undeclared wars in various regions of the country. They do not let the peoples of Cambodia, Afghanistan, Angola, Nicaragua, who have suffered enough, engage in peaceful construction. But now the policy of the state terrorism is somehow formulated as some sort of inevitability; some pseudoscientific foundation has seemingly been laid under it.

There is as little science here as there is in the domino theory, which has also been invented in Washington, and is applied to the developing countries. The entire theory, the entire science, consisting of comparisons of complex economic, social and political processes in various countries, is put on a par with dominoes which are arranged in a row. If you push just one of them, the others will fall. Such a comparison, according to the opinion which was and is being circulated in the United States, is sufficient to justify interference in the affairs of other countries, including military intervention.

The neoglobalism, that is, new globalism, is a theory which is not any deeper and not new at all. It is understandable why the old definitions have been sent to the archives, such as the policy of the big stick, as President Theodore Roosevelt put it, or gunboat diplomacy, the term of President Wilson's time: Such expressions cause an acute reaction of anger and protest.

In general, it is a long-standing political tradition in the United States for each president to have his own foreign policy formulation. For example, in regard to Latin America in the last century under President Polk, the concept of predestination was employed, which claimed that fate itself had determined that Latin America should be the United States' backyard. At the beginning of this century, they invented dollar diplomacy. However, all these concepts have one common objective: to hold back the liberation movement and stop historical development.

The basic idea in the present concept of neoglobalism is: All changes in the world which threaten the domination of imperialist powers are intrigues of international communism; without them there would be no struggle for social progress. Such science, to put it mildly, is completely detached from reality and this, incidentally, is realized even by many bourgeois figures. The developing countries, however, as they openly state in the United Nations and other international forums, are convinced that regional conflicts assume such a protracted and bloodthirsty nature precisely because of the very policy dictated by the concept of neoglobalism.

[Gerasimov] In this case, with Libya, we are indeed seeing the creation of a regional conflict by this very policy of neoglobalism.

[Yefimov] It could, perhaps, simply be called brigandage, because it involves trampling upon all international norms.

[Sobolev] As far as the Soviet Union is concerned, I would like to quote the new draft CPSU Program. It states that all peoples are worthy of living in a society free of social and national oppression, a society of genuine equality and genuine democracy. To liberate itself from exploitation and injustice is the sovereign right of an oppressed and exploited people. Moreover, it is pointed out in the program that exporting revolution is impermissible; nor is its enforcement from outside permissible. However, exporting counterrevolution is also impermissible. In order that 1986 should truly be Peace Year, ways toward the peaceful resolution of regional problems must be found. On the eve of the New Year, Comrade Gorbachev said: The Soviet Union is firmly disposed to seeing 1986 bring considerable progress in the cause of a political settlement in the Near East, in Central America, around Afghanistan, in the south of Africa, and in the Persian Gulf area.

Relations With Japan

And in conclusion, I would like to turn to the problems of Asia, an enormous region and the most heavily populated area of the world.

[Yefimov] I happened to be in Japan recently and talked with many of that country's leading journalists. I got the impression that the Japanese are showing serious interest in the idea, expressed by the Soviet Union and supported by a number of Asian countries, of finding a formula for all-Asian security.

[Sobolev] The Soviet Union calls upon the states of Asia to jointly participate in working out a common security formula, employing both bilateral and multilateral contacts. It also calls, in the long term, for an all-Asia forum for the exchange of opinions and search for constructive solutions to security problems.

[Gerasimov] And here, Japan's contribution would be very weighty, because it is one of Asia's leading countries. Indeed, in general, to discuss further Soviet-Japanese relations, I think that the people you spoke to, like those I spoke to when I was there, pointed out that there is a disparity between the international and political weight of the Soviet Union -- and of Japan, too -- on the one hand, and our political relation on the other.

There is also the same disparity between the economic potential of the Soviet Union and Japan on the one hand, and our economic relations on the other; that is, our relations are at an unsatisfactory level. In this respect, the Japanese are placing great hopes in the resumption, after a 10-year break, of consultations at the foreign ministers level, due to begin on 15 January.

If we look at trade, Soviet-Japanese trade fell in 1983 and 1984 and only grew somewhat in 1985 to the level of $4 billion. For us, on the whole, this is not really very much.

[Yefimov] It did not simply fall, it was deliberately reduced.

[Gerasimov] It was hampered by the consolidation of the Japanese-U.S. military alliance: Japan was called an unsinkable aircraft carrier by officials. There was a rehabilitation of the militaristic past, which could be called the spirit of Tsushima. All this has been happening. Nevertheless, it must be said that as early as last year, our relations began to improve. Aside from trade, which also increased, there were official visits by two Soviet ministers; there was a visit by parliamentarians; there were very broad meetings between the Soviet and the Japanese public; there were Soviet statements advocating the improvement of relations; there were reciprocal Japanese statements; and, of course, the Soviet-U.S. meeting in Geneva, played its role. Japan, to a large extent, follows the U.S. in foreign policy, so that, if the United States had agreed to a meeting, then, so to speak, God himself had ordered Japan to review its stance in this respect.

For example, Japanese Foreign Minister Abe said that after long study, they had come to the conclusion that the Soviet Union is genuinely striving to improve relations with Japan. Of course we are striving to improve relations. Japanese Prime Minister Nakasone said that he sees a fruitful beginning in the visit by the Soviet foreign affairs minister.

[Yefimov] The Soviet Government's decision on a moratorium on nuclear tests made an especially enormous impression on Japan, which is understandable. The mayor of Nagasaki, the mayor of the town which experienced the second and, fortunately, the last atom bomb, said that the Japanese assess the Soviet proposal very highly, consider it realistic, honest, and sincere, and they sincerely hoped that the United States would follow (?the example).

[Gerasimov] Still, I would like to talk about the obstacles which exist in the development of Soviet-Japanese relations. The Japanese used to talk about the concept of the inseparability of politics and economics, according to which the development of economic and other relations with us was tied up with a so-called territorial problem which does not exist -- with Japan's claims to four islands, the Kurile ridge, which were returned to us after the war. Now they are saying in Tokyo that although, from their point of view, the territorial problem allegedly does exist, a certain improvement of relations is possible. In any case, I think we can state that there is mutual striving for progress.

[Sobolev] Coming back to the broad concept of security in Asia, I would like to mention that the DPRK also advocates uniting the efforts of all Asian states in the name of ensuring peace and stability. Very recently, at the end of December, that country's head of government, Kang Song-san, visited our country. As a result of his official friendly visit, a new document on the expansion of economic and technical cooperation was signed. It is well known that dozens of national economic facilities have been built in the DPRK with our country's assistance. These can be considered the foundations of power engineering, machine-building, metallurgy, and other very important industries.

During an exchange of opinions on current international issues, it was noted that both our countries believe that, faced with the growing military danger stemming from the policy of the aggressive circles of imperialism, the strengthening of the unity and cohesion of the solialist countries is of the greatest importance. Stress was laid on the need for a comprehensive approach to security in Asia. The Soviet concept of security in Asia is supported by People's Mongolia, where Comrade Shevardnadze is also awaited, during the second half of the month. The 40th anniversary of the Soviet-Mongolian Treaty of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance is currently being marked. In accordance with this treaty, mutually advantageous trade exchange was increased many times over and fraternal Mongolia was able to accelerate its social and economic development.

For example, over the past 25 years alone electricity output in the republic has grown 17 times, coal extraction has increased more than eightfold, and the population's real income has quadrupled. Naturally, the country has its problems, but the cooperation and assistance from our and other socialist countries makes them easier to solve. Mongolia plays an active role on the international scene. I will recall one, but by no means the only, proposal it put forward on the working out and conclusion of a convention on mutual nonaggression and nonuse of force in relations between the states of Asia and the Pacific Ocean. The proposal was put forward in the interests of consolidating security in Asia and it remains in force.

As Comrade Gorbachev said, it is extremely important to ensure that this area is not a source of tension or a sphere of military confrontation. We advocate a broadening of political dialogue between all the states situated there in the interests of peace, good-neighborliness, mutual trust and cooperation. Let us hope that 1986 will bring good changes in this respect, too.

On that, comrades, we bring our broadcast to an end. Thank you for your attention. All the best!

U.S.-LIBYAN DIFFERENCES, BOYCOTT VIEWED

ID121715 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1530 GMT 12 Jan 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast, linkup with correspondents Valdimir Dunayev in Washington, Yuriy Vybornov in Rome, and Anatoliy Potapov in Paris, moderated by political observer Boris Kalyagin in Moscow -- recorded]

[Excerpt] [Kalyagin] The main theme in the world's press today is the crisis situation which has arisen around Libya. The Washington administration is continuing to fan the anti-Libyan campaign. Let us recallthat the White House has proclaimed economic sanctions against that country and is trying to impose them on others. Together with Israel, the United States is continuing with its military preparations for possibly delivering strikes against Libyan territory. As is pointed out in the TASS statement, this sort of action cannot be viewed other than as threatening peace and security not only in the Mediterranean area but also beyond it.

And to be sure not so long ago U.S. President Reagan called for prime attention to be paid to the settlement of regional conflicts which, in his opinion, represent the main reasonfor the deterioration in relations between the USSR and the United States and for an increase in international tension. And here then, the United States in the eyes of the entire world is artificially creating a new regional conflict, using as a pretext unsubstantiated and false arguments on Tripoli's involvement somehow in international terrorism.

Why is the White House playing with fire, which is dangerous for the entire world? What is your opinion, Vladimir Pavlovich?

[Dunayev] I think that what we are dealing with is an attempt to undermine the process started in Geneva. You know that right now, here in Washington, there is no industry, and also there are no military factories, but politicians and lobbyists in Washington speak with clear Texan and Californian accents and these states are, so to speak, the nerve centers of the military industry. In conditions where Geneva gave rise to such hopes, including among Americans, a frontal attack would not get through. That is understood. Therefore it was evidently decided to take this flanking approach and to fan chauvinism and also to move under cover, so to speak, under the hubbub of a regional and artificially created conflict, so to speak, to try inconspicuously to go off the rails of detente and off the Geneva rails into the Cold War rut.

And furthermore what intimidates the opponents of detente most of all is not even Geneva. What intimidates them is the possibility of accord before a new summit meeting.

[Kalyagin] And what is going on today in the U.S. capital? What are the U.S. Administration's latest steps in this direction?

[Dunayev] You know that by comparison with the beginning of the week, when incredible passions were raging and hysteria was kindled, now by the end of the week and over the weekend everything is a little easier although passions are raging especially on television. And today, Sunday, right now while this linkup is in progress, a program is due to start on U.S. television called "This Week With David Brinkley," and Pentagon chief Caspar Weinberger will be taking part in it. The voice of reason is not especially audible here although yesterday, that is, Saturday, there was an interesting thing on television. A U.S. oilman currently working in Libya appeared and this is what he had to say: If there was work for me at home I would go back, but I will stay in Libya regardless of any threats because I don't want to be the head of an unemployment-hit family in the United States.

[Kalyagin] Vladimir Pavlovich, Washington has unleashed economic aggression, but does the threat of purely military actions against Libya still remain?

[Dunayev] Well, you know, I think that it does still remain. Nevertheless, in the very near future, in the week to come I think that there will most likely not be any military action. Washington obviously wants first of all to get approximately 1,500 Americans who are currently in Libya out of the country and also, they are threatening people who don't obey them with very severe measures -- up to 10 years' imprisonment.

And second, obviously -- and here I want to quote how THE NEW YORK TIMES put another reason. It said that there is an unacceptable risk of losing too many U.S. aircraft at the hands of Libyan missiles and aircraft.

[Kalyagin] And now what is West Europe's position? That is a question that I want to put to our correspondents in Rome and Paris. Yuriy Viktorovich, let us recall that it was indeed on your doorstep at Rome airport that the terrorist action which the United States is using as a pretext for its anti-Libyan attacks occurred. The Italian authorities are currently carrying out an investigation in an attempt to find those responsible for the crime. What are they saying about this in Rome?

[Vybornov] I would indeed like to start with the investigation which the Rome prosecutor's office is carrying out.

[Kalyagin] Good.

[Vybornov] The sole surviving participant in the bandits' attack is being interrogated; and let us note that there are no signs which would indicate the notorious Libyan participation in the terrorist act. Incidentally, Italian Interior Minister Scalfaro also spoke about this on returning from a tour of several West European countries. As for the position, the attitude of official Rome to the so-called anti-Libyan campaign unleashed by the United States and on anti-Libyan hysteria, we must note that this matter was discussed recently at a meeting of the Cabinet of Ministers, as you can see now from these shots. [video shows cabinet in progress]

Italy has come out against any form of military interference. As for the economic sanctions which Washington is demanding, Italy has preferred to make its attitude to them dependent on the position of its West European allies.

[Kalyagin] And what is Paris' position on the U.S. anti-Libyan venture? Anatoliy Georgiyevich?

[Potapov] Well, France has not responded to Washington's call to support U.S. sanctions against Libya. Paris condemns this policy in principle.

[Kalyagin] And so even the close allies of the United States in the NATO bloc in general refuse to support U.S. sanctions. This has also been stated in the FRG and in Great Britain. British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher has even given the Reagan administration a bit of a talking to by pointing out that international laws must not be violated.

The threats from Washington and Tel Aviv have been condemned by Arab states and there has been sharp criticism of U.S. actions from the OAU and the foreign ministers of the Islamic Conference Organization. The United States has tried to isolate Libya on the international arena but has itself ended up in isolation.

The tense situation around Libya is the main theme of the world press today, but the attention of political circles is naturally attracted by other events of a more local nature.

NONALIGNED FORUM ON MONOPOLIZATION OF INFORMATION

LD121758 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1500 GMT 12 Jan 86

[Vladimir Beloshapko commentary]

[Text] A session of the intergovernmental coordination council of the nonaligned countries on information questions ended in Dakar, the capital of Senegal. Those who took part in the session stressed the need to eliminate the developing countries' position of dependency in the information sphere. Here is a MAYAK commentary with Vladimir Beloshapko at the microphone:

The developing countries' position in the information sphere really is extremely unfavorable. The thing is that UPI, REUTER, AFP, and other leading Western news agencies have virtually monopolized the exchange of information on a world scale.

As a result, it is from their reports that the developing countries learn about world events. Moreover, the paradoxical situation frequently arises whereby the Asian, African, and Latin American countries get their information even about the internal processes taking place in their countries from Western sources.

Overall, the picture is that the flow of information from the West to the developing countries is roughly 100 times greater than the flow in the other direction. This, as you can see, is an unnatural situation. It might have been acceptable if the Western information centers used their dominant position to cover events truthfully in order to strengthen cooperation and mutual understanding between peoples in the interests of peace and disarmament. Unfortunately, things are precisely the other way around.

Many just things were said in Dakar about the Western agencies that are propagandizing ideas of militarism and violence and foisting alien values on the nonaligned countries. In their reports they often deliberately and crudely distort the domestic and foreign policies of the liberated countries, particularly those which pursue a course that is independent of the West on the international scene. I can give a number of examples to confirm this. Libya currently has become the subject of just such a hostile and mendacious propaganda campaign; and the slanderous attacks against Democratic Afghanistan, the countries of Indochina, and Nicaragua are continuing. What is being waged against these and other countries is essentially an open propaganda war, and it requires resolute measures to decolonialize the excharge of information.

COMMENTARY, REPORTAGE ON U.S.-LIBYAN SITUATION

Shultz News Conference Cited

LD101523 Moscow TASS in English 1454 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] Washington, January 10 TASS -- Speaking at a news conference here, U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz came down hard on Libya and its leadership with slanderous attacks once again.

Giving a further boost to the runaway anti-Libyan campaign, he also issued a fresh call to America's West European allies to go along with its sanctions against Libya.

Shultz conceded, however, that "we haven't had a lot of success" in these efforts. But he made it plain that the U.S. was not going to ease its pressure on the allies to join the sanctions. He said that John Whitehead, a deputy secretary of state, would leave on a tour of several Western European capitals next week and would be "trying to be as persuasive as he can" to make the governments of those countries change their stands.

Reporting his statement, NBC television remarked the secretary of state had said informally that Western Europe had been presented with a choice of either backing the economic and diplomatic sanctions or putting up with U.S. armed interference in Libya in the future which was yet uncertain.

The ominous nature of the anti-Libya hysterics in the United States was graphically demonstrated by a proposal by Senator Howard Metzenbaum for an assassination attempt on leader of the Libyan revolution Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi. Speaking in an interview with a TV network in Cleveland, Ohio, he said the time had come to remove the Libyan leader physically. The senator added cynically that that would not be the first time the U.S. would try to do something like this.

Tripoli January 10 TASS -- Leader of the Libyan Jamahiriyah Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi strongly condemned the United States and Israel, accusing them of pursuing a policy of state terrorism on the international scene. Speaking at a news conference here, he said that in its striving to achieve world dominance and satiate its imperial ambitions Washington completely disregarded the interests of other nations. That could be seen from the example of Western Europe, he said. By deploying its medium-range missiles there, the United States actually turned the Western European into nuclear hostage. U.S. military bases in the Mediterranean posed a serious threat to peace, too. American imperialism, Mu'ammar al Qadhdhafi stressed, was the archenemy of nations, be it the Europeans, the Africans or the Arabs. The Libyan leader called for freeing the Mediterranean from U.S. military presence.

The campaign of threats and military blackmail against the Libyan Jamahiriyah, which had been launched by Washington and its ally Israel, was yet another manifestation of their policy of state-backed terrorism. But Libya, just as other Arab countries, refused to obey U.S.-Israelli dictates, Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi said. In keeping with the U.N. Charter the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah was prepared to exercise its right to self-defense. So far as economic sanctions were concerned, they were doomed to failure and could have an adverse effect only on the Americans that would wish to leave Libya under Reagan's instructions.

Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi criticized attempts to present the struggle by the Palestinian people for their legitimate rights as "terrorism". Wielding arms, the United States tried to "punish everyone raising his voice in defense of the Palestinians or being determined to uphold the right Libyan Arab nations to peaceful coexistence. The Libyan leader reaffirmed his country's readiness to continue giving all-round support to the Palestinians in their efforts to implement their lawful national rights, including the right to form an independent state of their own.

Washington, Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi went on to say, was giving Israel unqualified and comprehensive backing and supplying it with American arms which were being used against Arabs. It was with U.S. assistance that Israeli planes had bombed the Tunisian capital and it was with U.S. help that the raid against the Yemen Arab Republic had been prepared.

The Libyan leader said that in the course of contacts with the leaders of Arab countries an understanding had been reached to convene an emergency meeting of the League of Arab States at the level of foreign ministers in Tunis to discuss the issue of U.S.-Arab relations.

PRAVDA on Shultz Remarks

PM101928 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[Unnamed own correspondent dispatch under the general heading: "Campaign of Blackmail and Threats"]

[Text] Washington -- Slanderously accusing the Tripoli government of "terrorism," the U.S. Administration is intensively fueling tension around that Arab country, whose independent foreign policy has long "stuck in the craw" of U.S. strategists. As the press reports, a U.S. naval task force is already massed near Libyan shores. Observers are openly indicating that if the White House decides to carry out an attack the Navy grouping will play a leading role.

At the same time the administration is trying to completely block Libya's political and economic ties with the outside world. Above all with Western countries. As is well known, Washington for its part has already declared what is essentially economic war on Tripoli. After imposing a total embargo on all business dealing with Libyans and ordering Americans working there to return home on pain of imprisonment and fines, the White House has "frozen" Libyan assets in the United States. According to newspapers, the sum involved amounts to several hundreds of millions of dollars.

To the administration's unconcealed irritation, America's unlawful actions have not aroused the "appropriate response" from its allies, whom Washington would like to involve in the anti-Libyan adventure in order to give it the appearance of an "international campaign." The NATO partners rejected Washington's calls to follow its example and let it be known unambiguously that they regard such actions as "unwise." Judging from a press conference given today by U.S. Secretary of State Shultz, the administration has not however abandoned its intention of bringing its allies "into line." To a backdrop of accusastions of a lack of "Atlantic solidarity" and "egoism," the leader of the foreign policy department stated that Deputy Secretary of State Whitehead is going to tour the West European countries next week in an attempt to "persuade" them to join in the sanctions against Libya.

Be that as it may, high-ranking administration representatives are openly stating that the anti-Libyan measures taken by them so far are by no means America's "last word." Shultz again ominously stressed the possibility of using armed force against Tripoli.

The terrifying roars heard from Washington recently have poisoned the atmosphere here to such an extent that some politicians, succumbing to artifically inflated hysteria, are completely losing their sense of responsibility and realism. For example, what about Ohio Senator H. Metzenbaum's public call to assassinate Al-Qadhdhafi! In an interview on a Cleveland TV station, the senator bluntly stated: "We have possibly reached the point where Al-Qadhdhafi must be eliminated." "Do you mean that literally?" the journalist asked, unable to believe his own ears. "Literally, literally, why not? It would not be the first time for us," Metzenbaum replied.

Al-Qadhdhafi Assassination Proposed

LD111508 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 11 Jan 86

[Text] An American senator, Howard Metzenbaum, has publicly proposed organizing an attempt on the life of the Libyan leader Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi. The senator said in a television interview in Cleveland, Ohio that the moment seemed to have arrived when Al-Qadhdhafi had to be removed. Answering a reporter's question whether the senator meant assassinating Al-Qadhdhafi, Howard Metzenbaum said why not, since the United States would be doing such a thing not for the first time. An analysis from Valentin Lapin of Radio Moscow:

This statement by an American senator shows how brazen and sinister the anti-Libyan campaign now is in the United States. But the senator is right, generally speaking, in that Washington has indeed gained extensive experience in political terror. The American secret services have carried out numerous covert and overt operations to remove leaders of independent countries. Here are the names of some of them who have died as a result of assassination and plots: The head of the first government of the newly free state of the Congo, now Zaire, Patrice Lumumba; the Sri Lankan prime minister Solomon Bandaranaike; the Chilean president Salvador Allende and the Italian prime minister Aldo Moro. Each of these leaders did not suit Washington in some way.

Libya is one of the countries on America's black list, so to say, because the Libyans shut down the United States military base on their soil and nationalized their oil fields; because Libya has been actively resisting Israeli aggression; because it is opposed to Washington's attempts to impose an American order in the Middle East. And so, late in 1980 the United States secret services worked out a plan for a large scale subversive operation against Libya. At the first stage of the operation, professional terrorists were to have provoked clashes along the Libyan-Egyptian border and to have dumped bodies of dead men dressed in Libyan Army uniforms deep in the territory of Egypt. To incite strife between Arabs, Israeli Airforce planes with Egyptian insignia were to have made strikes on targets in Libya. At the same time warships of the United States 6th Fleet should have blocked Libya from the sea. The contents of the plan were reported by the Japanese magazine GENDAI.

It is possible that the plan was shelved for the time being due to the United States and Israeli intervention in Lebanon in 1982, but, according to this Japanese magazine -- quoting American secret service documents it has -- as soon as in 1984 another variant of the subversive anti-Libyan operation was drafted. Also in 1984, Libyans rendered harmless a group of terrorists who had the mission to kill Libyan leaders. The press in Libya at that time named among the United States accomplices Britain and the then Numayri regime in the Sudan.

Now there is a worsening of the situation in the Mediterranean again. This time too the United States would like to draw its allies into a subversive operation against Libya. It is putting pressure on the allies, since, for example, in Western Europe no one wishes to get involved in an adventure that carries the threat of sharply deteriorating the international climate. Only Israel, which itself follows a policy of government-sponsored terrorism against Arab nations, is ready to take part in the United States plans. Well indeed, Tel Aviv also has vast experience of murders, provocations and perfidious attacks. This experience is highly valued in the United States by those leaders who openly call for removing the Libyan leaders and for changing that country's system by force.

Reagan Interview Criticized

LD112233 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2125 GMT 11 Jan 86

[Text] Vienna, 12 Jan (TASS) -- President Reagan has yet again insistently appealed to the U.S. NATO allies to change their position in respect of Libya and to support American economic and trade "sanctions" against this country which he accused of "assisting terrorists financially and otherwise." In his interview to the Austrian newspaper DIE PRESSE, Reagan tried to persuade the Austrian Government that the terrorist act committed in the Vienna airport on 27 December is nothing else but "a military operation against Austria," which should be followed by an appropriate response. Austria, which as is known has refused to join the American "sanctions," can, in the President's words, alter its position, when the United States provides it along with other West European countries with additional information concerning Libya's involvement with the terrorists. At the same time, Reagan failed to answer what kind data is at the disposal of the U.S. Administration and why it did not present it earlier to the West European countries which have not supported the U.S. discriminatory measures against Libya.

'New Gross Attacks' by Shultz Noted

LD122212 Moscow TASS in English 2151 GMT 12 Jan 86

[Text] Washington January 13 TASS -- U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz has made new gross attacks on Libya during his appearance in a Sunday programme of the U.S. CBS TV network. Shultz stated that the Washington administration intended to continue efforts to draw West European allies of the United States into joint economic sanctions against Libya. Al-Turayki, Libyan minister of foreign affiars, who spoke during the same programme, condemned the application of sanctions against Libya by the United States.

Weinberger Interview Reported

LD122045 Moscow TASS in English 1953 GMT 12 Jan 86

[Text] New York January 12 TASS -- The United States intends to continue to drum up the anti-Libyan campaign to the utmost. This follows in all obviousness from an interview given by U.S. Secretary of Defence Caspar Weinberger to the ABC television network. He made it clear that Washington will step up pressure on the allies for the purpose of compelling them to join the sanctions against Libya. According to the Pentagon chief, if the attempts are not crowned with success, the USA is prepared to go beyond diplomatic and economic sanctions. He said the USA has intensified its efforts in the field of reconnaissance in the Mediterranean and around Libya to the utmost and that U.S. Armed Forces can and are prepared to perform most diverse actions.

PRAVDA Warning on U.S. Policy

LD120012 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 11 Jan 86

[Text] The Soviet national daily PRAVDA, in its weekly round-up of world affairs, says that if one traces the chronology of the military blackmail which Libya is being subjected, it becomes quite obvious that it began to grow long before the tragic explosions in Rome and Vienna. PRAVDA goes on to make these points:

Ships of the United States 6th Fleet were ordered to concentrate off Libyan shores and to conduct exercises there over a month ago. And American Administration spokesmen were even then making attacks on that country. It's been accused, if you please, of strengthening its antiaircraft defenses. In other words, it had installed surface-to-air missiles on its own territory. But from the Pentagon's viewpoint, this, it turns out, was a challenge to the United States' vital interests. It could deprive the American war-planes the chance to fly wherever they liked, thousands of kilometers away from America. Such is the extent of the imperial ambitions of the desire to treat the Middle East, plus the entire Mediterranean into the bargain, as its own backyard.

When one recalls the events, if only of the past few years, it is not hard to see that for Libya it was imperative to reinforce its antiaircraft defences. On 19th August, 1981, American fighters from the aircraft carrier Nimitz shot down two Libyan planes on patrol over the Gulf of Sidra. In October 1982 a naval aircraft of the United States 6th Fleet appeared in the vicinity of the city of Banghazi. In July, 1984, four American aircraft intruded into Libyan airspace and, on top of all this, there are the naval exercises conducted every year, if not several times a year, involving warplanes literally on the fringes of Libyan territorial waters.

But then the United States has long had it in for Libya and its leader Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi. Ever since the Second World War, America's biggest air base in Africa and the Middle East, Wheelus Field, was situated on the territory of that country. In 1970, soon after the overthrow of the monarchy, the base had to be closed down. Following that, the assets of various foreign companies, including American oil companies that operated in Libya, were nationalized partly and completely. The loss of the Libyan springboard, together with the collapse of the shah's regime in Iran, the disgraceful flight of the American marines from Lebanon, and the departure of Anwar al-Sadat from the political scene are listed by the Western press among the major setbacks for American policy in that region.

As part of the Middle East and the Arab world, Libya, PRAVDA says, is strongly critical of American policy, of the United States-Israel alliance and of the Camp David accords which in 1979 led to the conclusion of a so-called peace treaty between Egypt and Israel. Incidentally, the relations between Libya and Egypt, as between a number of other Arab countries, are rather complicated. At times passions reach a high pitch and the American press has more than once come up with the idea of teaching disobedient Libya a lesson by using Arabs themselves for this purpose, notably the Egyptians.

Now, too, such schemes have to some extent been afoot. On New Year's Eve there were reports of the movement of Egyptian forces towards the Libyan border, but in Cairo such reports were dismissed as a fabrication. In fact, when the threat of a real invasion began to loom over Libya, Egypt, just like Syria, Algeria, and Kuwait, Sudan, and other Arab states, expressed their solidarity. Nor has Washington, all the signs indicate, succeeded in involving the countries of western Europe, even its NATO allies, in its anti-Libyan campaign. Many of them, Federal Germany, Spain, Greece, Britain, and Switzerland have declared that they will not join the economic sanctions against Libya announced by President Reagan on Tuesday. A sober assessment of the situation and a realistic view of things are gaining the upper hand.

Unfortunately, PRAVDA continues, no such approach can be detected in Washington. The statement from the White House that further steps will be taken are [as heard] seen in many quarters as a hint that the United States has no intention of confining itself to economic sanctions and hasn't given up the idea of using military force. Journalists are pondering what form this might take, a short United States' air strike at some targets or a landing by the marines. Nor is it ruled out that America's dirty work will be done by the Israelis.

Threat after threat is issuing from Tel Aviv, too. The prime minister, Peres, has said that Israel will not leave unpunished either the increased activity of the resistance movement in southern Lebanon nor the events at the airports of Vienna and Rome. As usual he is placing all the blame for this on the Palestinians and their allies. The Cairo newspaper AL-AHRAM considers that Washington and Tel Aviv have reached agreement on Israeli airstrikes at Palestinian camps and other targets on the pretext of combating terrorism, and the main targets of the air raids have been chosen in Libya, Sudan, norhtern Yemen, Syria, and the Lebanese Al-Biqa valley.

The Soviet Union, PRAVDA says in conclusion, has most resolutely condemned the American and Israeli campaign of hostility against Libya, the economic sanctions, and the ostentatious war preparations. And PRAVDA quotes the statement of the official Soviet news agency TASS. In Soviet leadership circles, it said in it, it is expected that a sober understanding of existing realities will prevail in the United States, that it will seriously weigh the dangerous consequences that could follow from a continuation of its policy towards the sovereign Libyan state, and that it will not only itself display the restraint expected of it by the nations of the world but will rein in its rampant partner, Israel.

Those were the main points of a PRAVDA article on Libya.

'Dangerous Consequences' of U.S. Policy

OW112032 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1500 GMT 10 Jan 86

[From the Novosti newscast; Aleksandr Serikov commentary]

[Text] The situation continues to be tense in the Mediterranean region. Our commentary:

[Serikov] Hello comrades: We have already reported on the economic sanctions undertaken against Libya by United States which is trying to teach Libya a lesson for its unproven participation in terrorist acts at the Vienna and Rome airports. Most of the Western countries the United States urged to join the boycott expressed doubt over it, and some were very negative about it. For example, West German Chancellor Kohl rejected the U.S. proposal and said that there are some issues over which the FRG, a U.S. ally, has points of view diverging with those of Washington. The Libyan issue, he said, is one, and the United States must understand this.

However, Washington is obstinate and continues to attempt to pressure its stubborn partners. U.S. Secretary of State Shultz has announced that he intends to send one of his aides, Whitehead, to West European countries next Monday. According to Shultz, Whitehead is a great persuasion specialist.

At the same time, Washington is trying to turn the Arab world against Libya. Countries of the region are being told that the radicalism and the terrorism of Al-Qadhdhafi -- that is Washington's terminology -- present a danger to them first of all. Official Washington propaganda has failed here too. The Islamic conference which has just closed in the Moroccan city of Fes has expressed support for the Libyan Government position.

Many U.S. citizens living in Libya are rejecting Washington's order to leave the country. An American employee of the Libyan oil company said that his life is threatened not by the Libyans but by the U.S. Government. In our country as is said in the TASS statement on the situation in the Mediterranean region, it is expected that sound understanding of existing realities will prevail in the United States that it will seriously weigh the dangerous consequences to which its continued policy with respect to the sovereign Libyan state may lead.

PRAVDA on U.S. 'Economic War'

LD111053 Moscow TASS in English 1007 GMT 11 Jan 86

["A Campaign of Blackmail and Threats" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow January 11 TASS -- Calumniously accusing the Tripoli government of "terrorism", the U.S. Administration is working up tensions around that Arab country whose independent policies have long become a source of extreme annoyance to American strategists, says a dispatch from Washington published in the newspaper PRAVDA today. Reminding readers of the demonstrative muscle-flexing off the Libyan coasts, the paper goes on:

At the same time the U.S. Administration is trying to block all of Libya's political and economic ties with the outside world, primarily with Western countries. Washington for its part is known to have already declared what is in essence an economic war on Tripoli.

To Washington's unconcealed annoyance, unlawful U.S. actions failed to evoke a "fitting response" among the American allies whom Washington wanted to draw into an anti-Libyan adventure so as to give it a semblance of some "international campaign", PRAVDA stresses. NATO partners rejected Washington's requests that they follow its example and stressed in no uncertain terms that they considered such actions "unreasonable". Judging from the remarks made by U.S. Secretary of State Shultz at a news conference Friday, the Administration, however, has not abandoned attempts to make its allies follow suit. And one more point: High-ranking Administration officials do not bother to conceal that the anti-Libyan steps made by them so far are not the "last word" of the United States. Secretary Shultz, for example, threateningly stressed that armed force could be used against Tripoli, PRAVDA writes.

U.S. Isolated in Anti-Libya Campaign

LD111945 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1900 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Commentary by political observer Aleksandr Zholkver]

[Text] The news items which you have been hearing vividly show on the one hand the scale of Washington's frantic anti-Libyan campaign, and on the other the widespread protests that it was evoked throughout the whole world.

In this connection we cannot fail to mention the fact that the present provocative actions against Libya are an integral part of the overall aggressive U.S. course, which American political specialists themselves have recently been calling new globalism. It is a matter, evidently, of Washington arrogating to itself some kind of right to dictate to other states how they should conduct their external and even internal affairs, what friends they should have, what economic policy they should pursue, how they should vote at the United Nations and what trade they should conduct and with whom. When some or other country does not wish to follow such so-called recommendations and an independent policy is pursued with criticism made of this or that aspect of U.S. policy, and maybe there is a refusal to accommodate U.S. military bases on one's territory, as was indeed the case with Libya, or when there is a refusal to allow nuclear ships into one's ports, as was the case with New Zealand, then such countries are blacklisted by Washington, which sets in motion against them different versions of a policy of force, ranging from economic sanctions to gunboat diplomacy. Incidentally, the black list which has on this occasion been made public by the U.S. State Department includes, besides Libya, Syria, Iran, Cuba and Democratic Yemen. We can hardly forget either that the United States has been concentrating its warships not only near the shores of Libya but also near the shores of Nicaragua, and for the umpteenth year now an undeclared and bloody war is being waged against Afghanistan.

But how does Washington act in regard to its own allies? It did not even deem it necessary to consult with them about its anti-Libyan actions but merely presented them with a fait accompli, and is now trying through its ambassadors to get them to support the aggressive U.S. course in the Mediterranean. True, little has come of this so far. An American observer has even stated that it is Washington, and not Libya, that finds itself isolated.

CANADA YIELDS TO U.S. PRESSURE, JOINS ECONOMIC 'BLACKMAIL'

LD110730 Moscow TASS in English 0705 GMT 11 Jan 86

[Text] Ottawa January 11 TASS -- Canada has yielded to U.S. pressure to join the Reagan administration's economic blackmail of Libya. Canadian Prime Minister Brian Mulroney said in a statement here that his government had decided to cut off all financial assistance to Canadian companies doing business with Libya from January 10. It had also been decided to suspend negotiations on any new contracts to sell high-tech drilling equipment to that country. The statement did not rule out that the ban could be extended to cover also other kinds of machinery. But Canada did not recall its specialists working in Libya under contract.

IZVESTIYA ON 'VITUPERATIVE' ANTI-SOVIETISM IN U.S.

LD101951 Moscow TASS in English 1925 GMT 10 Jan 86

["Washington Rambo's on the Rampage" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow, January 10 TASS -- It was, perhaps, precisely when President Reagan's speech writers were inserting in the text of his New Year address to the Soviet people words about ways to build a better understanding between the USSR and the USA that the telephone rang in the hall of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, IZVESTIYA says. A voice said in broken French: "We are going to make short shrift of your ambassador and of all of you into the bargain on Monday, December 30... ."

After a short pause, the voice repeated this threat in English and slammed down the phone. The message was clear both in French and in English. It was also clear that the nice words of the U.S. Administration about the need to build trust between the two countries were not at all backed by day-to-day deeds, which were far from friendly.

Let us turn to facts: An atmosphere of vituperative anti-Sovietism and suspicion towards the Soviet diplomatic personnel and Soviet representatives in the USA that is encouraged by the U.S. official authorities is now going far beyond the "usual" boundaries. Just the other day the Federation of Young Republicans in Maryland passed a resolution calling for the proclamation of Maryland a zone "free from Soviet presence." The Republican gathering passed an appeal, to the vicious cries and catcalls of Maryland thugs, for closing recreational facilities for Soviet diplomats and the Soviet Young Pioneers' camp for children. A booklet calling for doing away with "Soviet spies" was distributed to participants in the gathering and its recommendation was to give them a tar and feather treatment and to throw them into the Chesapeake Bay. One can get the wrong impression that all this merely is the bragging of political nincompoops. Far from it! U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Ridgway has openly announced the plans of the Republican administration "further to restrict Soviet presence in the USA." It is symptomatic that American secret services are more and more often enacting provocative scenarioes with "Russian spies" playing the main role. They do not shrink from the dirtiest tricks, as was the case with an outrageous act of provocation carried out with the participation of U.S. national Jeffries. Having planted its agent, the FBI made out to arrest him and to expose a "Soviet spying operation."

American newspapers had begun to coach Young Republicans who were to participate in an anti-Soviet gathering in Maryland long before it opened. They carried lists of the numbers of diplomatic cars used by Soviet officials to make sure that the thugs would not make a mistake.

So they did not. Some time ago, when the Soviet ambassador to the USA was at a White House reception, a group of thugs came up to his car in an officially guarded parking lot. They spewed out abuse at Soviet representatives and shouted anti-Soviet slogans. These "trust-building measures" are taken against Soviet citizens in the USA virtually on a regular basis. During last September alone (30 days) a many as 27 anti-Soviet demonstrations were organized in front of the Soviet Embassy in Washington, just two blocks away from the White House.

An act of gross arbitrariness was perpetuated in California in December 1985 against two diplomats from the Soviet general consulate in San Francisco. In violation of the Soviet-American consular convention, they were subjected to a body search and were kept virtually under arrest at a police precinct during two hours.

Recently somebody painted with a hand shaking with malice the word "Rambo" right on the pavement near the entry to the Soviet Embassy on the 16th street. It is the name of the film in which an American superman fights the "red hordes" and, naturally, vanquishes them. "Rambo" is not only the name of a film but also a symbol of today's America which, in the idea of the authors of that thriller, must always play its muscles threateningly and hide behind a "space shield." Such lowly anti-Soviet products have never before appeared on the screens of movie houses and on American television, not even in the days of the infamous "witch hunter" Senator McCarthy. Sequences on anti-Soviet themes are a "novelty" in American advertising. They are regularly commissioned, for instance, by the owners of the nation-wide network of snack bars and also by some booksellers and publishers cooperating with the U.S. Information Agency (USIA). This "circumstance" did not escape the attention of American observers. THE WASHINGTON POST wrote on December 22, 1985, that the cold war seemed to be deliberately whipped up, at least, judging by commercial advertising on American television. The PHILADELPHIA INQUIRER added, as it were, that the latest anti-Soviet film constituted a giant step to the right and many of them even back into the age of McCarthyism.

So on the one hand we have calls for "better understanding" and on the other the true attitude of the official authorities, which are actually inspiring provocative anti-Soviet campaigns. Moreover, while in the first case we only have nice words and good wishes, in the second concrete acts of hostility are perpetrated acts which in the commonly understood diplomatic language are characterized as being at odds with every existing norm of international law, IZVESTIYA says in conclusion.

ZORIN ANALYZES REAGAN NEW YEAR MESSAGE

LD120241 Moscow in English to North America 2300 GMT 11 Jan 86

["Moscow Viewpoint" by Valentin Zorin]

[Excerpts] The exchange of New Year messages between Mikhail Gorbachev and Ronald Reagan has met with a positive response here in the Soviet Union. We see it as another sign of a change for the better in Soviet-American relations. Having reacted positively to President Reagan's statement that there must never be a nuclear war the Soviet people have noted that this statement could have carried more weight if it were backed up by concrete moves.

In that sense the underground nuclear test carried out by the United States on the New Year's Eve greatly devalues President Reagan's statement. And the case in point is not confined to carrying out that nuclear test alone. The entire policy of the United States aimed at continuing the arms race and the race in nuclear weapons remains the same after the Geneva summit, and after the agreements reached at Geneva no corrections have been made to it. The Soviet public also paid attention to President Reagan's statement that the United States democratic system is based on the faith in the sanctity of human life and the rights of the individual.

In his TV address President Reagan said that every human being is God's unique creation with special talents, abilities, hopes, and wishes. This is a very good statement and a very right one. But when I heard it I recalled the encounter I had in Washington's Lafayette Square. My attention was drawn to a middle aged man who was sitting on a bench. Standing next to him was a supermarket cart which contained everything that he had. There are 4 million homeless people in the United States, 4 million of God's unique creations having special talents, abilities, hopes, and wishes. Speaking about human rights President Reagan emphasized the rights to free speech and the freedom of assembly, movement and worship. These are, of course, important rights, written into both the Soviet and United States Constitutions. One has to note with regret, however, that the American Constitution doesn't guarantee such important rights as the rights to free education and medical care, or housing and maintenance in old age. These inalienable human rights are strictly honored in the Soviet Union. Homelessness and unemployment are simply impossible in the USSR. Regrettably the American president didn't say anything in his address about the human right to life. In his address to the American people Mikhail Gorbachev emphasized the need to pool efforts to guarantee the people the right to life. Let's undertake, Mikhail Gorbachev said, to put an end to the threat looming over mankind and let's not ask our children to do it. I believe that this inalienable human right must never be forgotten.

BOVIN VIEWS STRUGGLE WITHIN U.S. ON FOREIGN POLICY

LD312038 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1455 GMT 31 Dec 85

[From the "International Panorama" program presented by Aleksandr Bovin]

[Text] Comrades, many people favor cooperation buy many are opposed to it. Geneva has indeed intensified and strengthened the political struggle within the United States on foreign policy. This struggle also embraces the upper echelons of authority.

For example here is what Henry Kissinger, whom you all know, writes: The most serious problem is to overcome what is almost a real civil war among functionaries of the U.S. apparatus alongside a no less heated public debate. The new phase in relations between East and West, continues Kissinger, must begin with the settlement of these internal conflicts. Otherwise the favorable opportunity which currently exists will be lost and that will allow the Russians to take advantage of this conflict to the detriment of the United States. Well, Kissinger's conclusion is not entirely accurate. The point is not that the Russians will take advantage of disagreements in Washington; the point is that because of these same disagreements the Americans will lose the advantage which they could gain from improved relations with the USSR. At the center of the quarrels in Washington is indeed the problem of SDI. The Pentagon as well as the military industrial complex are trying to harden the White House's position and the President himself is evidently as yet incapable of distinguishing his cosmic mirages [as heard] from earthly realities. There are a considerable number of political analysts who believe that while the current President is in power agreement on disarmament is improbable.

But there are other aspects to this. As you know our unilateral moratorium on nuclear explosions expires tomorrow. We are prepared to continue not carrying out tests if the Americans follow our example. We have agreed to the mutual verification [kontrol] which Washington made such a fuss about for such a long time. But again we hear no. Or to be more precise this is even what they say to us: in principle we are not opposed but we must wait, we must think again, we must talk again and so on. And incidentally it was with regard to this that the U.S. journal NEWSWEEK recalled the prayer which is attributed to Saint Augustine in his youth. This was his prayer: Lord make me pious, deliver me from sin ... but not yet. And so the United States is saying no because that is what the star wars program requires.

Let me quote from the paper NEWSDAY: The fact that the United States will most probably reject the Soviet proposal on banning underground nuclear tests is explained by the President's decision to continue the series of underground tests designed to develop a space laser gun activated by nuclear explosions. This is indeed confirmed by the new explosion which the Americans carried out on Saturday, as you know.

They have also, as we know, rejected our proposal on stopping antisatellite weapons tests. In truth the Pentagon has met complications here. Recently the conference Committee of the Senate and the House of Representatives decided on the complete cancellation of the program for testing antisatellite systems if the President cannot prove to Congress and confirm that the USSR has carried out such tests later than 3 October this year. But (?Simms), a Pentagon representative stated indignantly: We absolutely cannot understand the reasons which prompted Congress to make such a decision which does not contribute to the process of strengthening peace nor to the arms control process.

It is funny to hear the Pentagon which spends hundreds of thousands of millions of dollars suddenly starting to show concern for the pockets of Americans. The point here is that on 12 December when the Air Force launched two ASAT testing targets into space the launch cost approximately $20 million and now the Pentagon is grieving if the Congress bans testing -- for that would mean that these $20 million of tax payers' money was wasted. Now just take in this astounding logic: First I take your money and then I start complaining that I'm not being allowed to spend it.

Generally speaking it isn't easy dealing with Americans. They dance about intimidating themselves and intimidating us, showing their fists. But nowadays it is generally better to show intelligence though that is, of course, harder.

PENTAGON BUILDING UP SPECIAL PURPOSE TROOPS

LD110748 Moscow TASS in English 0655 GMT 11 Jan 86

[Text] New York, January 10 TASS -- TASS correspondent Maksim Knyazkov reports:

Getting ready for fresh armed ventures against sovereign states, the Pentagon's building up the numerical strength of its special purpose troops. TIME reports that in the past three years the numerical strength of the commando troops, assigned the role of the crack force of the U.S. military machine, has (?grown) almost by one third to reach 15,000. Advanced weapons and combat technology are flowing to the bases of the Green Berets, Rangers, Delta Troops and Seals, the Navy's subversive forces. In fiscal 1986 alone the Pentagon will spend 1,200 million dollars to build up and fit out those groups of specially trained cut-throats. The figure is an almost three-fold rise on 1982.

Fire can be heard day after day at the bases in Fort Bragg, North Carolina, Hurlburt Field, Florida, and at other secret sites of the Pentagon as commandos are trained in operations to capture targets and to abduct and kill people. Washington makes no secret of the purpose of these preparations, "I have no doubt that low-intensity conflict is the sort of scenario we'll be fighting in coming decades", Jeffrey Record, an expert on military affairs, has stated.

The Pentagon already tested its special forces in the bandit invasion of Grenada in 1983. According to TIME, teams of subversives from Seals unit landed on the island to seize a radio station and a Delta unit had been secretly infiltrated into Grenada even before the main invasion to capture the local prison and release criminals, who had been assigned the role of the "fifth column." Now the Pentagon is going to unleash armed acts of aggression against Libya, Nicaragua and other states whose governments are not to the liking of the U.S. Administration.

PENTAGON INVOLVEMENT IN U.S. SHUTTLE LAUNCHES NOTED

LD121810 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 12 Jan 86

[Text] The space shuttle Columbia was launched today from the Cape Canaveral, State of Florida. The launch, originally planned for 18 December of last year, has been postponed seven times. The seven-man crew includes Bill Nelson, a member of the House of Representatives of the U.S. Congress. According to the AP agency, in the course of the 5-day flight, the cosmonauts will launch a communication satellite, take pictures of stars and the galaxy, using ultraviolet cameras, and also carry out a number of medical experiments.

Commenting on the Columbia's launching, the U.S. press notes that a considerable part of all shuttle flights are carried out according to Pentagon programs. As known, the U.S. Defense department has already reserved for itself more than one third of all launches of the space shuttle program.

SENATOR URGES LIFTING RESTRICTIONS ON EQUIPMENT SALES

LD101842 Moscow TASS in English 1528 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] Washington January 10 TASS -- Senator Lloyd Bentsen (Democrat, Texas) has sent letters to U.S. Secretary of State George Shultz, Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige as well as to Secretary of the Treasury James Baker. In the letters he called for the lifting of restrictions on the sale of oilfield equipment to the USSR.

The senator has admitted that the policy of various kinds of trade-and-economic "sanctions" with regard to the Soviet Union, the sanctions which Washington has repeatedly resorted to for the purpose of putting political pressure on it, has failed. "I strongly believe", the letters emphasize, "that we should not impose embargoes unless the target country is hurt worse than the United States is". Having pointed out that the restrictions imposed on the export of oilfield equipment to the USSR by the U.S. Administration are due to expire on January 20 of this year, the senator warns that they should not be renewed because the restrictions have given the foreign competitors of the United States "a major market" and have "cost the United States hundreds of millions of dollars in sales and thousands of jobs."

PRC EXPRESSES 'CONCERN' OVER U.S.-LIBYA TENSION

LD102339 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Jan 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Speaking at a press conference in Beijing, the head of the Information Department of the PRC Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Ma Yuzhen, said that the government expresses concern in connection with the reaction of the United States and Israel, which are threatening to use armed force against sovereign Arab states, under the excuse of the fight against terrorism. The Chinese Government, Ma Yuzhen declared, comes out against such an action, which represent a violation of the norms of international law.

CPC CONFERENCE EXAMINES PARTY WORK STYLE

PM130953 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "Conference in Beijing"]

[Text] Beijing, 11 Jan -- XINHUA reports that a conference convened by the CPC Central Committee Secretariat has been held in Beijing involving 8,000 responsible workers of central party, government, and military institutions and devoted to questions of "correcting the party's work style." The participants were addressed by Hu Yaobang, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, and other Chinese leaders.

The conference adopted a decision to begin work to "improve the party style" in central leading organs. The speeches noted that "various manifestations of an unhealthy style are occurring" within departments and organizations and among a section of leading cadre workers.

The conference put forward the demand to "step up ideological education," "strengthen discipline," "investigate major, important matters seriously," and "improve intraparty life." The CPC Central Committee Secretariat has created a leading group to "correct the party work style in central institutions."

EFFORTS TO IMPROVE TIES WITH PRC NOTED

OW122202 Moscow in Mandarin to China 1600 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] Socialist countries adopt a policy of unflinchingly promoting peace and and developing international cooperation to oppose the United States and aggressive NATO bloc's policy aimed at sabotaging detente and speeding up the arms race and military confrontation. This is pointed out by the latest issue of PROBLEMY DALNEGO VOSTOKA.

Touching on socialist countries' unswerving efforts for international detente, this magazine emphatically pointed out the Soviet Union's action aimed at developing the Soviet-Chinese relations. An article carried in the magazine pointed out: The Soviet Union is willing to greatly improve its relations with China and believes that if both sides are willing, the wish can become a reality. The Soviet Union believes that it is necessary to restore overall cooperation between the two countries. The quarterly believes it is in the interests of the Soviet and Chinese peoples and can help strengthen Asia's security.

GORBACHEV REPLY GIVEN TO JAPANESE SCHOOLGIRL

OW101119 Tokyo KYODO in English 1110 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] Nagoya, Jan. 10 KYODO -- Soviet leader Mikhail Gorbachev has answered a letter from a Japanese elementary school girl here, saying in his reply that he and the Soviet people will do more work for world peace. Gorbachev answered Aiko Fukuda, 12, a student at Nagoya's Higashishiga elementary school, after he received her letter congratulating him on his meeting with U.S. President Ronald Reagan and asking him to work harder for world peace. In his return message to the girl, who is studying elementary Russian, Gorbachev said "Thank you for your letter and a happy new year. May the year 1986 be a good one for you and your family."

The oral message was conveyed Friday by a first secretary from the Soviet Embassy in Tokyo who visited Aiko with the reply and a surprise New Year's gift. After reading the message in Japanese, the official presented Aiko picture books, a record containing Russian folk songs, a biographical book on Lenin and a typical Russian kettle. Aiko, oldest daughter of businessman Kazuo Fukuda, decided to follow in the footsteps of Samantha Smith, an American schoolgirl who wrote to the late Yuriy Andropov in 1983, and sent a letter to the new Soviet leader late last year. "I am so happy to receive an answer. I had not expected to receive one," she said in an interview.

Aiko said she hopes to become an interpreter someday, adding that she will continue learning the Russian language. She began studying Russian last April with the idea that she would do something that no one else did, so she enrolled in an adult's Russian class offered to the public by a group of Chukyo University teachers. Inspired by the Geneva summit between Gorbachev and Reagan, she decided to send the letter which she wrote in Japanese and asked her teacher to put into Russian.

NO AGREEMENT ON USSR-JAPAN DRAFT COMMUNIQUE

OW111209 Tokyo KYODO in English 1155 GMT 11 Jan 86

[Text] Tokyo, Jan. 11 KYODO -- Japan and the Soviet Union are unable to narrow their differences over the content of a proposed communique less than a week before Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze's visit to Tokyo, Foreign Ministry sources said Saturday. The snag centers on Japan's claim to a cluster of Soviet occupied islands off northern Japan, and Tokyo may refuse to issue the communique unless the Soviets soften their stand, the sources said. The sources outlined the Japanese positions as the government released more details on the itinerary of Shevardnadze's January 15-19 visit, the first by a Soviet foreign minister in 10 years.

Shevardnadze will have three sessions of talks with his Japanese counterpart, Shintaro Abe, the first starting on the day of his arrival in Tokyo Wednesday morning. The first session will be devoted to a discussion of international issues of mutual interest, and the second, scheduled for Thursday morning, will cover both international issues and bilateral ties. The third and last session, to be held on Thursday afternoon, will be devoted entirely to bilateral relations, Foreign Ministry officials said. Shevardnadze will take a break from official engagements on Friday with a sight-seeing tour in Tokyo and a trip to inspect a car plant just outside Tokyo.

He is slated to pay a courtesy call on Prime Minister Yasuhiro Nakasone on Saturday morning, and sign two agreements on trade and taxation in the evening.

The Soviet foreign minister will speak to the press on Sunday morning before leaving Japan in the afternoon.

While Japanese and Soviet officials have agreed on Shevardnadze's schedule, they remain bogged down over the proposed communique, Foreign Ministry sources said. They said the soviets have refused to accept a Japanese draft referring to Japans claim to the "northern territories" as part of unresolved issues between the two countries. The northern territories, seized by the Soviets at the end of World War II, are a cluster of islands just off eastern Hokkaido, the northernmost of Japan's four main islands. The Japanese draft, first shown to the Soviet Union at the end of last year, seeks to confirm the validity of a communique signed by Japan and the Soviet Union in 1973. That was the last time Moscow formally recognized Japan's claim to the northern islands as part of "unsettled issues" between the two countries. The Soviet Union has since reversed its stand, saying there is no territorial dispute with Japan.

A Soviet draft communique presented to Japan earlier this week made no reference to the 1973 communique, signed by the then Soviet leader, the late Leonid Brezhnev and then Prime Minister Kakuei Tanaka. Japanese sources said Japan may refuse to issue a communique unless the Soviets accept the inclusion of the territorial issue in the document.

SHEVARDNADZE VISIT TO JAPAN 'KEY EVENT'

LD102153 Moscow World Service in English 1531 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Pavel (Rozin) commentary]

[Text] On 15th January a member of the Political Bureau of the Soviet Communist Party's Central Committee and Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze will arrive in Japan for an official visit. Our commentary has been prepared by Pavel (Rozin).

A Soviet-Japanese dialogue at such a high level is a key event of international life. The two great nations have a heavy political weight on the world scene and possess impressive economic, scientific, and technical potentials. The dialogue can influence considerably the situation in the Asian and Pacific regions. In the last 10 years this is going to be the first visit by a Soviet foreign minister to Japan. The many questions that have accumulated in Soviet-Japanese relations over these years require a thorough discussion.

The coming dialogue follows a whole range of bilateral contacts at various levels. The contacts became more active in autumn 1984 after years of stagnation, but the two countries overcame a trend for curtailing trade and economic relations. These began to grow step by step last year, and in other fields too contacts, both intergovernmental and nongovernmental, grew more active.

The Soviet Union has always favored friendship and mutual cooperation with Japan. Over the last few months Japanese Government leaders, too, have said time and again they would like to help promote a dialogue with the Soviet Union and make headway in the solution of some practical questions. In short, a good foundation has been laid for fruitful talks.

We are aware, however, of problems in Soviet-Japanese relations. On a whole range of international problems and bilateral relations, the future of these relations to be exact, the two nations hold different views, so different, that they are sometimes poles apart. What's more there are groups, fairly influential ones in Japan and elsewhere, that are opposed to progress of any kind in Japanese-Soviet relations.

These groups try to prevent agreements, conditioning them in a way that the Soviet Union can never accept. They keep accusing the USSR that it tries as best it can, as they claim, to drive a wedge in Japan's relations with other countries, first of all the United States. Nothing can be further from the truth. The Soviet Union has never sought to capitalize on setting nations at loggerheads, and it has never even planned to interfere in matters that concern Japan and the United States as two interested sides. But if it comes to plans and actions in the military and other fields aimed at damaging the security of other nations, primarily the USSR, and endangering international peace, then this country gives it an assessment and it does this openly and in a principled way.

Now let's see who is fond of sowing discord in international relations. Take for one what the United States defense secretary had to say in an interview with the Japanese paper SANKEI on 1st January. Caspar Weinberger could do no better than give the Japanese reading public a New Year present of vicious anti-Soviet slander. He claimed the Soviet Union's military threat to Japan had been growing and that the Soviet Union wanted to establish control over the (?Ratkanai) region, for instance. It is just one example of an unconcealed wish to drive a wedge in Soviet-Japanese relations.

We would like to hope that at the talks with the Soviet foreign minister the Japanese side will not listen to the prompters who don't want our two nations to improve relations. We hope it will try to make the dialogue fruitful. A dialogue of this kind, we believe, must be based on the profound understanding of the role of Soviet-Japanese relations in developing the situation in the Asian and Pacific region and the understanding of the two nations' responsibility for international peace.

The Soviet Union is ready to act. It has always favored relations with Japan in the spirit of goodneighborliness, trust, and mutually advantageous cooperation. Time and again it has backed this position with concrete actions. The Soviet Union is in favor of solving problems and looking constructively for the ways of further improving bilateral relations. We firmly believe there is every opportunity to do this. The Soviet Union and Japan are close to each other geographically, each has an impressive economic, scientific, and technical potential. Cooperation in these fields would objectively benefit both. Besides, our two nations are equally interested in averting the nuclear threat and strengthening peace and security in the Far East. The talks will take place at the beginning of a year, and as the proverb goes, well begun is half done! It is essential to take the talks with full responsibility in order to lay a good foundation for favorable bilateral relations for the rest of the year and the more distant future.

BANDURA VIEWS SOVIET-JAPANESE RELATIONS

PM101246 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Yu. Bandura article: "USSR-Japan; Time Demands Changes"]

[Text] The year that has just ended -- 1985 -- was a difficult and sometimes tense year for our planet. The number of symptoms making it possible -- after a protracted break -- to talk once again about the possibility of positive changes in such an important sector of international life as Soviet-Japanese relations are therefore all the more noticeable.

The results of the forthcoming visit to Tokyo by the USSR foreign minister will allow us to judge with great accuracy just how sturdy these new shoots are.

It is no accident that heightened attention is being devoted to the approaching Tokyo meetings -- and not just in the two countries' capitals. And this probably has nothing to do with the fact that the visit will be the first visit to the Japanese capital made by the leader of the Soviet diplomatic department in the last 10 years. The fact that the Tokyo talks are themselves a response to the demand of the time -- a demand to raise the level, expand the scale, and deepen the content of the Moscow-Tokyo dialogue -- is much more substantive.

This demand is being placed upon the agenda particularly vigorously by long-term tasks, first and foremost the tasks of ensuring reliable security for the Asia-Pacific region and the tasks of turning it into a zone of peace and equal cooperation.

While retaining realistic positions, we must not, of course, impatiently glance at the stopwatch expecting miracles. The effect of artificially created factors -- not created by the Soviet side -- that check progress toward stable and responsible good-neighborliness today influence Soviet-Japanese relations and will continue to influence them in the foreseeable future.

The Soviet Union cannot remain indifferent to phenomena that arouse such concern even in other countries such as the high pace -- unjustified by the objective situation -- of the buildup of the Japanese Armed Forces' military potential, the qualitative changes to Japan's long-term military programs, and the attempts to rehabilitate a past condemned by the peoples. Nor does the tendency for Japan to be increasingly deeply involved in U.S. thermonuclear strategy and the increasing overall danger for the countries of the Far East and the Pacific Ocean go unnoticed. Attention is also drawn to actions within the framework of the Washington-Tokyo-Seoul "triangle."

Both in Japan itself and beyond there are forces that are not interested in bringing the positions of the USSR and Japan closer on the most important questions of international life and are hostile to both countries pooling their efforts in resolving the fundamental questions on which the interests of the Soviet and Japanese peoples cannot fail to coincide.

But, in retaining the same realistic positions, we have to recognize something else too: There is no reason for confrontation between Japan and the USSR in mutual relations between the two states. On the contrary, the growth of interdependence in the present day world and the spotlighting of the task of ensuring mankind's survival expand the zone of common interests, making it possible through joint efforts to seek and find solutions according in equal measure with both sides' interests. The past year provided considerable confirmation of that.

Attention is drawn first and foremost to the restoration and revival of political contacts initiated by the meetings between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU central committee, and Japanese Prime Minister Y. Nakasone in March 1985. This was followed by a trip to Expo-85 in Japan by a representative Soviet delegation, official visits to Tokyo by the Soviet ministers of culture and, of the fish industry, and a visit to the Land of the Rising Syn by a delegation from the Soviet-Japanese Section of the USSR parliamentary group. In turn, a Japanese parliamentary delegation visited the USSR. Bilateral consultations were held at deputy foreign minister level.

Contacts between social organizations continued to develop (in particular, a meeting of representatives of the Soviet and Japanese public held last summer in Hokkaido, for which a 220-strong delegation came from the USSR, was a notable event).

Last year was also typified by a number of positive points in the sphere of practical mutual relations.

It was possible, in particular, to overcome the trend clearly observed over the last few years for trade and economic ties between the two countries to fall off, a trend that has been engendered by attempts to exploit trade as a tool for putting political pressure on the USSR. Talks linked with concluding an agreement on commodity exchange and payments for 1986-1990 and a convention on avoiding double taxation have been successfully concluded. The drawing up through joint efforts of an agreement on cooperation in the fisheries sphere -- one of the first international documents directly linked with the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea -- is of great importance.

All these points, and first and foremost the activation of political dialogue, make it possible to assert that the overall atmosphere in Soviet-Japanese relations has improved.

In November 1985 it was stated from the rostrum of the USSR Supreme Soviet: "We favor an improvement of relations with Japan and are confident that this possibility is realistic." Recently there have also been authoritative statements in Japan in favor of improving relations with the Soviet Union. This gives grounds for stating that the sides do not wish to dwell on what has been achieved. And Japan's positive reaction to the Soviet-U.S. summit in Geneva confirms the justifiability of that conclusion.

The changes are all the more remarkable because until quite recently relations between the two countries were typified by a tendency toward destabilization and to reject many of the achievements of the late sixties and early seventies on which the edifice of Soviet-Japanese good-neighborliness was built through joint efforts.

The responsibility for this turn for the worse -- and this must be said quite definitely -- by no means lies with the Soviet side. Our course in mutual relations with Japan has been and continues to be consistent, principled, and invariably aimed at ensuring good-neighborliness, mutual trust, and mutually advantageous cooperation. The Soviet Union has demonstrated its adherence to this course through a number of initiatives whose implementation would accord equally with the interests of the Soviet and Japanese peoples and would promote an improvement in the international situation in the Far East and in the Asia-Pacific region as a whole.

These initiatives continue to be open for fruitful discussion today. The Soviet Union is also prepared to examine constructive proposals from the Japanese side that are consonant with the spirit of the time and free of (the old concept of) egoistic "national interests."

This approach would make it possible for both sides to focus their efforts on realizing the considerable opportunities for improving Soviet-Japanese relations and to concentrate attention on those specific questions on which the positions of Moscow and Tokyo coincide, are close, or can be brought closer. The range of potential points of contact here is extremely extensive -- from practical steps to organize new mutually advantageous ties and expand those already existing by switching them to a long-term basis through to making a joint contribution to working out a comprehensive approach to security problems in Asia.

In the nuclear age and under conditions of continuing heightened tension, the questions of ensuring security are at the center of attention of all peoples and all states. Neither the USSR nor Japan are excluded from this general trend. That is why I think that in the Soviet-Japanese dialogue questions relating to ensuring the security of the two neighboring states and adjacent regions must finally take up their proper place.

Nobody expects an easy and fast resolution of these questions. But it is necessary to resolve them, relieving them along the way of the burden of mutual suspicion.

The Soviet Union makes no secret of its interest in this and demonstrates it in all avenues, striving to end the arms race, remove the threat of a thermonuclear conflict, and prevent the militarization of space. On these fundamental questions the interests of the USSR and Japan cannot but coincide. All the more so since the experience of mutual relations between our countries convinces us that attempts to ensure Japan's security that take no account of the USSR's security interests and, moreover, damage them can do no good. And on the contrary, an improvement in Soviet-Japanese good-neighborliness that is geared to the future and does not harm other countries' interests and the normal mutual relations of the USSR and Japan with certain states would open up considerable opportunities for joint efforts in resolving regional problems from positions of equality, mutual advantage, and identical security. I think that it is on this path that Japan could ensure and resolve a national task such as balancing the country's industrial and technical potential with its role in the international community.

The year 1986 is opening with, on the whole, favorable prospects for progress in these directions. Is an era of stable Soviet-Japanese good-neighborliness based on a reliable foundation approaching? The answer to that question will depend in no small measure on whether Japan succeeds in rejecting the attempts still current in certain circles to hitch the prospects for improving Soviet-Japanese relations to calculations on achieving some kind of feelings toward Japan and nurtures no selfish plans. And it is justified in counting on reciprocity.

To judge by the statements voiced in Tokyo recently by Japanese leaders, our hopes are not without foundation. Complete confidence in the well-foundedness of those hopes, however, can only be provided by specific deeds. Deeds stemming from the realization of the indisputable fact that the USSR and Japan are neighboring states and therefore, so to speak, doomed to good-neighborliness. "Doom" is not the most joyful word in the dictionary. But it quite accurately reflects reality when applied to those who still think that for our countries confrontation is natural or permissible. As for the Soviet and Japanese peoples, for them reliable and strengthening good-neighborliness crammed with real content is no longer a depressing alternative but a call of the time gained through the suffering of the past and guaranteeing a future free from hatred and suspicion.

SOVIET NUCLEAR SUBMARINE BEING TOWED NEAR JAPAN

HK120728 Hong Kong AFP in English 0653 GMT 12 Jan 86

[Text] Tokyo, Jan 12 (AFP) -- A Soviet nuclear-powered Echo-II class submarine was sighted for a second successive day today in the East China Sea under tow from a salvage and rescue tug, Maritime Safety Agency officials said. The crippled submarine, which was accompanied by a destroyer, was first sighted being towed off Okinawa yesterday.

The officials said that the 6,200-ton submarine was spotted moving northward some 400 kilometers (250 miles) west of Makurazaki, on the southern-tip of Kyushu Island. Defense Agency officials said that the submarine had apparently developed trouble in its reactor. It was the third time in six years that Soviet nuclear-powered submarines had been sighted on the surface in waters near Japan apparently after developing engine trouble. In August 1980, an Echo-I class submarine caught fire off the east coast of Okibna, killing nine crewmen. In September 1984, a Golf II class ballistic missile submarine sailed for several days spewing white smoke off Okinoshima Island, in the Sea of Japan.

DRA ISSUES STATEMENT IN SUPPORT OF LIBYA

LD122227 Moscow TASS in English 1953 GMT 12 Jan 86

["Statement by the DRA's Foreign Ministry" -- TASS headline]

[Text] Kabul, January 12 TASS -- The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan (DRA) -- has issued a statement in support of the Libyan Jamahiriyah and the Libyan people in the face of the threat of a military aggression on the part of the USA and Israel.

The tension which has been artificially created around Libya on the plea of fighting terrorism indicates, the statement, says, that the United States has not abandoned its aggressive and predatory plans with regard to Libya. The statement also stresses that the economic sanctions which are being hurriedly applied by the White House as well as the decision to evacuate more than fifteen hundred U.S. citizens from Libya are an evidence that Washington has made the first step toward a direct aggression against that sovereign country.

This is also evidenced by the concentration of U.S. naval forces near the Libyan coast, the alerting of Israel's military forces, the concentration of troops at the Libyan-Egyptian border, and by the putting of the U.S. allies' military bases in the region in a state of readiness.

The DRA's Ministry of Foreign Affairs is stating that, in the event of an aggression on the part of the USA and Israel, Libya can count on support on the part of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan. The DRA wrathfully condemns U.S. subversive actions against Libya and demands an immediate end to military preparations and to the economic sanctions.

U.S.'MAIN INSPIRER, ORGANIZER' AGAINST DRA

LD102256 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Vladimir Fadeyev commentary entitled: "Who Is Hindering the Process of Normalization of the Situation Around Democratic Afghanistan"]

[Text] Over several years of working in Afghanistan I have repeatedly had occasion to encounter the various aspects of the dushmans' criminal activity. I have seen entire kishlaks [villages] from which the bandits, using either force or deception, led almost all the inhabitants into the territory of neighboring Pakistan. Almost all, because those who remained behind in the kishlak, refusing to leave the paternal home, were shot on the spot. I had occasion to run into the most bitter thing you can ever encounter on earth -- the grief of children, moreover on an indescribable scale. More than a million Afghan children were unable to sit down at a school desk this year because about 2,000 school buildings in the country were destroyed by dushmans. Those who could go to school are forced to start working for bread not just for themselves, but for their brothers and sisters also because their parents have died at the hands of the bandits. In the country's towns explosions can still be heard in shops, movie theaters, and buses; in pharmacies and hospitals; and even in mosques. All of this is the handiwork of counterrevolutionary bands whose members, under the leadership of foreign advisers, including U.S. ones, receive special training in camps on the territory of neighboring Pakistan. More than 100 such camps have already been established.

The Afghan people have become tired of war. The government of Democratic Afghanistan has more than once turned to neighboring Pakistan with a program for the political settlement of the situation around Afghanistan. But Islamabad, under all kinds of pretexts, is evading discussion and resolution of these questions. This is taking place because a political settlement around Afghanistan is not wanted, first and foremost, in the White House. It is the United States which is the main inspirer and organizer of the undeclared war against the Afghan people. Along official channels alone the White House has forked out hundreds and millions of dollars to the dushmans for the acquisition of modern weapons, which are used against men, women, and children. There is everything in the dushmans' arsenal today, starting with surface-to-air missiles and ending with mines disguised as children's toys. U.S. military and financial assistance is also carried out along secret channels of the Central Intelligence Agency.

Ideological sabotage against a sovereign state is also on the conscience of official Washington. Following the example of the White House boss himself, the dushmans are being called nothing other than fighters for faith and patriots in the West. The United States, using the Afghan problem, is inspiring a campaign of lies and hatred against the Soviet Union, which as the whole world knows well, extended a helping hand in reply to the request of the Government of Democratic Afghanistan at the moment when the fateof the sovereignty and integrity of the state was being resolved. This is well known throughout the whole world and they also know in Washington, but nonetheless they sanction generous receipts in dushman public coffers of further hundreds of millions of dollars in the current financial year. This means they will again be spent on weapons, turning into the blood of the peaceful Afghan people.

'ANTI-AFGHAN CAMPAIGN' WAGED BY IMPERIALIST FORCES

PM101651 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[Veniamin Shurygin "Commentator's Column": "Afghanistan's Just Cause"]

[Text] The Afghan people are marching confidently along the path of building a new life. Each day brings good news of their successes in resolving the complex scioeconomic problems inherited from the prerevolutionary past. After all, before April 1978 Afghanistan was one of the poorest states in the world, over 90 percent of the population could not read or write, and the average life expectancy was 45 years. In Afghanistan today schools and hospitals are being constructed everywhere and new industrial enterprises are being installed. The generation of electricity and the production of natural gas, cement, and mineral fertilizers are increasing. Agricultural production is increasing. bhis is being considerably assisted by the implementation of the land and water reform. The successes in economic development are helping to improve the people's living standard.

The people's welfare is a priority of the policy of the PDPA and the country's government. They are taking steps aimed at creating an atmosphere for constructive dialogue between the country's different social and political forces, including those who still have a negative attitude toward the April revolution.

The main obstacle in Afghanistan's development along the path of peace, democracy, and social progress isthe undeclared war which is being waged against the Afghan people by the imperialist states -- the United States and it allies. They are supplying weapons to the gangs of the Afghan counterrevolution deployed in special camps on Pakistani territory. U.S. instructors train the dushmans in how to blow up bridges, schools, and hospitals, wreck reprisal against teachers and doctors, and sow terror and destruction. They are also taught how to don the uniforms of Soviet soldiers and kill women, old men and children in the hamlets in an attempt to discredit the internationalist aid which is being rendered to the friendly Afghan people by the limited contingent of Soviet troops in Afghanistan.

The imperialist mass media are conducting a malicous anti-Afghan campaign. High-ranking officials, including denizens of the White House, frequently take part in it. While verbally advocating a settlement of regional conflicts, in practice they are doing everything to try to aggravate the situation surrounding Afghanistan. Inveterate bandits and cutthroats figure in their speeches as "freedom fighters." In this way they want to dupe the U.S. and other peoples by presenting the thrust of the events taking place in a false light and to whitewash Washington's policy of overt interference in the sovereign state's internal affairs.

The past year has been marked by major events in Afghanistan's political life. Elections to the local organs of state power (jirgas) have been held. A number of important measures have been taken aimed at expanding the social base of the national democratic revolution. The course of events shows that the PDPA's domestic and foreign policy is supported by the broad people's masses. And that is a guarantee of the Afghan people's success in the struggle for abright future and in defense of the gains of the April revolution.

DRA PROGRESS CONTINUES UNDER PDPA LEADERSHIP

LD102329 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1545 GMT 10 Jan 86

[From "The World Today" program presented by Farid Seyful-Mulyukov]

[Text] U.S. politicians have a double standard in their approach to regional problems and world problems as a whole. Those who are fighting for the freedom and social progress of their peoples, for the sovereignty of their states, and for elementary human rights are branded by Washington as disturbers of the peace and labelled as terrorists, but the counterrevolutionary bands, whether they be in Nicaragua, Angola, Cambodia, or Afghanistan, are called freedom-fighters and champions of human rights.

On the other side of the ocean one has recently observed a fresh fit of anti-Afghan and anti-Soviet hysteria. More and more frequently high-ranking U.S. officials including the master of the White House are also involved in this slanderous campaign. In this respect, as the progressive social and economic transformations in the DRA deepen and the Soviet Union's internationalist assistance to the Afghan people who are waging a courageous struggle for their future, expands, there is an expansion too of the scale of the malicious anti-Soviet campaign in the United States, which strives in every way to exacerbate the situation regarding Afghanistan.

I have had occasion to visit the country, several times, including long before the April revolution tyranny, and in subsequent years when the United States and its allies launched an undeclared war against the Democratic Republic.

Prior to the revolution Afghanistan, according to UN data, was considered one of the poorest and most backward countries in the world. It was only after April 1978 that the country embarked on the path of fundamental transformations in its economic and social life.

Even now, when bands of dushmans, who are armed to the teeth with U.S. weapons and who have been trained in special camps in neighboring Pakistan's territory, are attempting to drown Afghan soil in blood, the April revolution has al ready brought tangible fruits. With the assistance of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries 95 economic projects have been built in Afghanistan. Our country has sent to the friendly neighboring state not only its officers and men who, together with the Afghan Armed Forces, are guarding the peaceful life of the people from the bandit attacks by U.S. mercenaries, but also thousands of doctors, teachers, and highly qualified specialists.

In the years that have elapsed since the April revolution hundreds of schools and hospitals and new industrial enterprises have been built in Afghanistan. Eleven million peasants have been freed from indebtedness to usurers and land-owners. Over 320,000 families have received land in the course of impelementation of the agrarian reform. Over 1.5 million Afghans have learned to read and write.

The acknowledged vanguard of the Afghan working people, the People's Democratic Party of Afghanistan, is leading the country along the path of the construction of a new life. Recently, Afghan leaders adopted measures to get a constructive dialogue going between different social and political forces, including even those who previously had a negative attitude toward the April revolution.

It is reported from Kabul today that a joint meeting of the PDPA Central Committee Political Bureau and of the Revolutionary Council of Afghanistan Presidium has been held under the chairmanship of Babrak Karmal. The meeting considered the question of pursuing a principled course aimed at strengthening the social basis of revolutionary power. For this purpose it is planned to include in the republic's steering bodies nonparty figures from among authoritative representatives of all classes, social strata, ethnic groups, and tribes.

Washington and its allies feel that a sharp change is taking place in the life of Afghanistan. New social groups in the population are siding with the April revolution. Therefore, in order to reverse the historic course of events on Afghan soil the United States is intensifying and expanding the scale of the undeclared war.

Hundreds of millions of dollars are being put at the disposal of the dushmans as well as tons of up-to-date weaponry including rockets. U.S. instructors train the dushmans in camps that are situated on Pakistani territory in barbarous methods of warfare against the people including how to blow up bridges, schools, and hospitals; how to take reprisals against teachers and doctors; and how to terrorize the peaceful population.

The American CHURCHMAN magazine writes that the Reagan administration is casting prudence to the wind in order to whitewash the aggression against Afghanistan and get back for the Afghan people the rights to illiteracy, ignorance, hunger, unemployment, and disease. There you have the real policy of the United States toward Afghanistan; its slanderous fabrications against the Soviet Union are directed at concealing this brigandage against a people that has chosen the path of freedom and progress.

DRA FORCES' SUCCESSES AGAINST REBELS REPORTED

LD130936 Moscow TASS in English 0850 GMT 13 Jan 86

[Text] Kabul, January 13 TASS -- Security forces of the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan have staged a number of successful operations to liquidate counterrevolutionary gangs which were sent into the country's territory from abroad.

According to the BAKHTAR news agency, a big gang of mercenaries was destroyed in the Rawat area. Almost 80 counterrevolutionaries were killed, more than 50 were taken prisoner. One more gang was liquidated in the area of Qarghah. Scores of counterrevolutionaries were killed or wounded.

More than 50 counterrevolutionaries were killed in the course of an operation in the Barkah Shamand area. Foreign made weapons were captured, among them recoilless guns, mortars, grenade launchers, anti-tank and anti-infantry mines, fire arms. Several depots of weapons which belonged to bandits, were discovered in the Sorkh Rud District, the Nangarhar Province.

FURTHER REPORTAGE ON TALYZIN'S VISIT TO HANOI

Meets Pham Van Dong

LD102342 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Jan 86

[From the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Pham Van Dong, member of the Vietnamese Communist Party Central Committee Politburo, chairman of the Vietnamese Council of Ministers, today received the Soviet party-governmental delegation which is in Hanoi, led by Comrade Talyzin. The same day, Pham Van Dong received the heads of the delegations of the socialist states participating in the latest session of the CEMA committee on cooperation in the planning sphere, which is taking place in Hanoi.

Meets Le Duan

LD112222 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 2000 GMT 11 Jan 86

[Text] Le Duan, general secretary of the Vietnamese Communist Party Central Committee, today received the leaders of delegations participating in the 37th meeting of the CEMA planning cooperation committee in Ho-Chi-Minh City. The Soviet delegation is led by Comrade Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Gosplan.

In his speech to participants in the meeting, the Vietnamese leader expressed profound satisfaction with its results. He stressed that consistent implementation of the comprehensive program for scientific and technical progress adopted at the 41st extraordinary CEMA session meeting has exceptional importance for the whole of the socialist community.

Protocol Signed

PM131023 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[Text] Hanoi, 11 January -- Talks have been completed here on the coordination of state plans between the USSR and the SRV for the period 1986-1990. The signed protocol envisions implementation of the most important points of the Long-Term Program of Development of Economic, Scientific, and Technical Cooperation between the USSR and the SRV and the decisions of the Economic Summit Conference of CEMA countries, and also the accords between the leaders of the two countries.

The basic guidelines of Soviet-Vietnamese economic cooperation have been coordinated for the next 5-year period and, in some sectors, for a longer period. The volume of reciprocal trade will increase 1.7 times. The economic and technical assistance and all-round economic aid rendered by the Soviet Union in the development of the SRV's national economy is being significantly increased. It is planned to continue deliveries to Vietnam of complete sets of equipment for the construction and equipping of power, transport, machine-building, chemical, and mining enterprises, the development of communications, and the expansion of the network of academic, medical, and science institutions. At the same time, exports to the USSR of a number of Vietnamese commodities are increasing, primarily agricultural products -- natural rubber, vegetables, fruit, tea, coffee, and light and local industrial goods.

The talks between the leaders of the USSR and SRV planning organs proceeded in an atmosphere of fraternal friendship and complete mutual understanding. The protocol was signed by N.V. Talyzin, candidate member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, and chairman of USSR Gosplan, and by Vo Van Kiet, member of the Politburo of the Vietnamese Communist Party Central Committee, deputy chairman of the Vietnamese Council of Ministers, and chairman of the Vietnamese State Planning Committee.

SRV STATEMENT ON MIA MEETING REPORTED

LD102009 Moscow TASS in English 1824 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] Hanoi, January 10 TASS -- The government delegation of Vietnam and the United States have expressed satisfaction with the results of the meeting between them in Hanoi on January 6-7 on the question of a search for missing in action (MIA) Americans, says a statement issued here today by a spokesman of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam (SRV). The U.S. side, the statement points out, highly appreciated the good will of the government and people of Vietnam. The sides reached agreement on some aspects of the forthcoming actions. Efforts were made to create favourable conditions and to cooperate with each other with a view to implementing a two-year plan for a MIA search.

The sides agreed to regard the MIA problem as a humanitarian one and not to make it a political condition for the normalisation of relations between the two countries. The Vietnamese side confirmed that it does not keep a single U.S. prisoner-of-war and is ready to conduct the search if the U.S. side provides it with necessary data.

MARCOS ORDERS INVESTIGATION OF CIA INTERFERENCE

LD130921 Moscow TASS in English 0830 GMT 13 Jan 86

[Text] Manila, January 13 TASS -- Philippine President Marcos has ordered an investigation into facts of interference of the U.S. Central Intelligence Agency in the internal affairs of the country. The order was issued in response to reports in the local press that the CIA tried to influence the election campaign and financed anti-governmental groupings and organizations.

Groups of American "observers" and "advisers" are arriving in the Philippines one after another allegedly to ensure "free and fair presidential elections," scheduled for February 7. However, their gross intervention in the internal affairs of the country is so obvious that the state electoral commission had to issue a warning that foreign "observers" were prohitited directly or indirectly to support political parties or their candidates, take part in the election campaign or be present at the polling stations during voting.

FURTHER ON VISIT BY SFRY'S RAIF DIZDAREVIC

PRAVDA on Dinner Speeches

PM101810 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 86 First Edition p 4

[TASS report under the general heading: "In an Atmosphere of Friendship and Mutual Understanding"]

[Text] E.A. Shevardnadze [member of the CPSU Central Committee Politubro and USSR foreign minister] gave a dinner in honor of R. Dizdarevic [SFRY federal secretary or foreign affairs].

The dinner was attended by L.N. Zaykov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, leader- of a number of ministries and departments, and other officials; and, on the Yugoslav side, by officials accompanying R. Dizdarevic.

Addressing the guest, E.A. Shevardnadze said:

We have every reason to be pleased with the way that affairs between our countries developed last year. During the year important meetings were held between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and party figures and statesmen from Socialist Yugoslavia, meetings which are of great and fundamental importance for the further deepening of mutual un-erstanding and cooperation. A great deal was done to expand political contacts, interparty ties, and collaboration in the international arena and to develop mutually useful exchanges in the sphere of culture, science, technology, and trade. Today it can be said with satisfaction that the pulse of Soviet-Yugoslav relations is steady and strong.

We look forward with confidence in the knowledge that the foundation on which our friendship was reborn and the sentiments of comradeship and mutual respect that were strengthened is firm and has been tested by life.

The Soviet Union and Yugoslavia agree that there are universal principles and norms that must be strictly observed in relations between states. The common denominator here is the recognition of the sovereignty of every people and any country as well as their right to determine their own destiny themselves and to choose their path of development independently.

Stable, strong, and just peace can exist only in a world of equals -- equals not in strength but in rights and duties. Even today, however, one encounters a world out-look which postulates that "some are more equal than others." It is this premise that underlies the philosophy of so-called "new globalism" invented in Washington to justify its hegemonist policy.

Behind all this is an overt and flaunted disdain for states' sovereignty and their right to build their lives as they wish.

"New globalism" is not an abstract theory. In practice it means the desire to impose one's will on peoples. The forces exemplifying it arbitrarily set about punishing countries they dislike. They always keep some sticks at the ready for use in attempts to intimidate the "recalcitrant." The attempts to scare Libya are an example of that. That country is being subjected to an economic blokkade and threatened with direct armed intervention.

The peoples will not accept the concept of "limited [urezannyy] sovereignty" and will not adjust their freedom and independence to fit in with arbitrarily interpreted "U.S security interests." We can see how the Arab world is rallying to the defense of the Libyan people. The Arabs' unity is the guarantee that the aggressive plans toward Libya will be thwarted. All progressive countries also oppose the anti-Libyan plot. Its very organizers are internationally isolated.

In their opposition to interference, pressure, and diktat -- on whatever pretext they may be implemented -- anti-imperialist forces can continue to count on the Soviet Union's firm support. "Its sympathies," Comrade M.S. Gorbachev stated, "are wholly on the side of peoples struggling to independently implement their inalienable right and to freely decide their own destiny and to achieve independence and social progress."

One cannot, however, fail to see the other side of these attacks on the foundations of international stability. They are being stepped up at a time when the world has started speaking hopefully about the "Geneva spirit," linking it with the prospect of reducing tension and returning to the policy of detente in relations among states.

And now the forces that would like to hinder this are making themselves felt. They are attacking the Geneva accords.

The process begun in Geneva responds to the interests of all the peoples. They want a switch to constructive, mutually useful cooperation among states in all spheres. Soviet-Yugoslav trade and economic ties are developing successfully; essentially we have no problems here. This situation is predetermined by the fact that the USSR and Yugoslavia are socialist states building their relations on the principles of total equality, mutual advantage, and comradely mutual assistance. We conduct trade and economic affairs taking into account each other's interests, utilize a form of mutual payment that suits each side, and do not allow debts to mount. Moreover, we strive at the same time to stimulate the development of certain types of production and help certain sectors of the economy in our countries to cope with the difficulties that arise. And, understandably, neither we nor you even think of linking trade and economic matters with anything else.

Unfortunately, some of our partners forget this golden rule. There are governments in the Western world that regard trade deals as an opportunity to make something akin to a "double profit" -- they add to the cost of the goods additional conditions that have no bearing on trade transactions. If some people think that policy can be applied here, they are in for a bitter disappointment in both policy and trade. And, on the other hand, conscientious and honest trade can create the prerequisites for constructive political dialogue. The same can be said of ties in other spheres.

The Soviet Union and Socialist Yugoslavia occupy and operate from common positions on questions of war and peace. We perceive our task as being to remove the nuclear threat, to diminish the military danger, to curb the arms race on earth, and to prevent it in space.

The Soviet Union resolutely condemns the U.S. "star wars" program and the stance of those states which are, in one way or another, joining in its implementation. This is a military program through and through. It is designed to secure domination in space in order to gain an opportunity to dominate on earth. The governments being drawn into the implementation of such a dangerous project must know this.

People in the Soviet Union highly value Socialist Yugoslavia's vigorous activity for the benefit of peace, for the affirmation of the principle of peaceful coexistence in relations between states, and for strict observance of the requirements of the UN Charter and the norms of international law.

This activity has earned deserved international prestige for your country. Yugoslavia plays a well known role in the Nonaligned Movement, which is an important force in the contemporary world and enjoys our invariable respect.

We value the open and sincere nature of our relations and the strengthening friendship between the Soviet and Yugoslav peoples, and will do everything to ensure that this remains so in the future.

Speaking in reply, R. Dizdarevic expressed sincere gratitude for the cordial hospitality and the warm words about USSR-SFRY friendship.

We can jointly state with satisfaction that we have achieved very good results in many spheres of cooperation -- the political, economic, cultural, scientific, technical, and other spheres. Developed relations and cooperation exist between the LCY and the CPSU. On the whole, our cooperation is distinguished by its increasingly multifaceted nature and richness of content, and this accords with nutual interest.

The fruitful economic cooperation, which is constantly developing and advancing, is a highly important sphere of our relations as a whole.

The meetings and talks between Yugoslav and Soviet leaders have always been particularly significant for the development of our relations and cooperation.

The comprehensive exchange of opinion and political dialogue at various levels is expanding and becoming permament in our relations, becoming an exceptionally important practice in the achievement of mutual understanding and the definition of mutual interests and potential for cooperation.

The arms race, military conflicts and hotbeds of crisis in different parts of the world, and the increasingly deep gulf between developed and underdeveloped countries pose a threat to peace and to mankind's existence.

Socialist, nonaligned Yugosalvia, the federal secretary for foreign affairs went on to note, makes its contribution to the cause of preserving peace and creating conditions for the unhindered development and security of all peoples and countries in the world. The policy of nonalignment and the Nonaligned Movement, to which Yugoslavia belongs and which contains 100 countries, have proved themselves to be a positive factor in contemporary international relations.

He declared that Yugoslavia welcomed the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva as an important step toward improving the international situation and easing tension. The international community greeted the results of this meeing with hope, and it is entitled to expect the positive processes to expand and to lead to specific results, primarily in the sphere of disarmament and the elimination of hotbeds of crisis. We welcomed, R. Dizdarevic said, all the important initiatives and proposals by the Soviet Union and Comrade M.S. Gorbachev in the sphere of disarmement, resumption of dialogue, and affirmation of the policy of talks. All this meets with a positive response and support in Yugoslavia and the entire world.

The world expects that, under the conditions of the revival of dialogue, the talks in Geneva, Stockholm, and Vienna will lead to the first steps in the direction of disarmament. We have in mind primarily the need to ban all tests of nuclear weapons and, of course, the renunciation and prohibition of their use, and the need to prevent the transfer of the arms race to space and to reach agreement on reducing and eliminating all types of mass destruction weapons.

There can be neither a relaxation of international tension nor any progress toward more reliable peace unless the settlement of existing crises and seats of tension is embarked on immediately.

Yugoslavia is following with great anxiety the development of the latest events in the Mediterranean and the Near East, where a new and dangerous exacerbation is now taking place, accompanied by direct threats, the use of force, and hostile intervention. We resolutely condemn Israel's aggressive threats against individual independent Arab countries, and the Libyan Jamahiriyah in particular. Our country has always resolutely opposed and continues to oppose all threats of force or other forms of pressure aimed against the fundamental principles of relations between states and against peace and stability in that part of the world.

In conclusion, R. Dizdarevic expressed satisfaction with the atmosphere and contents of the talks, which confirmed the mutual readiness for and interest in constant exchanges of opinion and dialogue on the further advancement of Yugoslav-Soviet relations and on key international problems.

The dinner proceeded in a warm, friendly atmosphere.

More on Cultural Agreement

LD101728 Domestic Service in Russian 1600 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] On 9 January in Moscow a 3-year cultural cooperation program was signed between the USSR and Yugoslavia. It was signed on the Soviet side by Shevardnadze, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and USSR foreign minister, and on the Yugoslav side by Dizdarevic, SFRY federal secretary for foreign affairs, who is in the USSR on an official friendly visit.

Here is what he stated to our correspondent.

[Begin Dizdarevic recording in Serbo-Croatian with superimposed Russian translation] Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union practice fairly wide and rich cooperation in the fields of culture and education. The program which has been signed is simply a continuation of what has been begun. I think that some of the undertakings envisaged in it represent a step forward in the further development of cultural cooperation as regards the quality and significance of the whole range of Soviet-Yugoslav relations and the deepening of mutual understanding between our countries and even greater familitarity of the peoples of the SFRY and the USSR with achievements in the fields culture and art. This program is based on the same principles as the relations between our countries -- the principles of reciprocity, common interests, and respect. I am certain that the program which has been signed will constitute yet another step in our mutual understanding and enrichment through cultural and spiritual values. [end recording]

PRAVDA on Gromyko Talks

PM101914 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 86 First Edition p 1

[TASS report: "Talks With a Guest From Yugoslavia"]

[Text] In the Kremlin on 10 January A.A. Gromyko, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, received R. Dizdarevic, SFRY federal secretary for foreign affairs, who is paying an official friendly visit to the Soviet Union, and the persons accompanying him on the trip.

Some questions of Soviet-Yugoslav relations and also of the contemporary international situation were discussed in the talks, which were held in an atmosphere of friendship and mutual understanding.

A.A. Gromyko spoke about the progress of the preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress -- the most important political event of the year which has just begun -- and the forum of Soviet Communists, for which Soviet people are preparing a fitting greeting. For his part, R. Dizdarevic reported on the measures being implemented in the SFRY on the threshold of the 13th LCY Congress.

During the talks, the mutual interest in improving Soviet-SFRY cooperation in every way was confirmed. This cooperation is developing on the firm basis of jointly formulated principles and accords. It was emphasized that meetings and talks between M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the Yugoslav leaders are of fundamental significance for the steady development of relations between the two countries and the deepening of mutual trust.

Both sides advocated continuing fruitful bilateral political contacts, including along parliamentary lines. Interest was expressed in the further development of mutually advantageous economic, scientific, technical, and other kinds of cooperation, which are constantly being enriched with promising modern forms.

It was pointed out during the discussion of urgent international problems that the present international situation is passing through a complex and exceptionally crucial stage in its development. Under these conditions the need to use collective efforts to remove the threat of war, reliably bar the way to the militarization of space, and halt and reverse the arms race on earth is moving to the center of world politics. Here the ultimate goal must be general and complete disarmament and lasting peace on earth.

The practical realization of the accord reached during the Soviet-American summit meeting in Geneva, constructive steps aimed at resolving the key problems of the present, constant struggle by all the world's progressive democratic forces against the threat of war -- only this can ensure a change for the better in international relations and lead to radical positive changes in the world's political atmosphere.

Discussing the situation on the European Continent, the sides expressed the conviction that this part of the world, with its huge political and economic potential and its unique experience accumulated during the period of detente, could be the place where the process of improving the situation will once again begin to gather momentum and where the policy of widening contacts and strengthening trust among countries will gain the upper hand.

A positive assessment was made of the Nonaligned Movement as an influential anti-imperialist force which has a positive impact on the situation and makes a weighty contribution to the struggle for international security.

Dizdarevic Visits Uzbekistan

LD112127 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1230 GMT 11 Jan 86

[Text] A conversation between Comrade Usmankhodzhayev, first secretary of the Uzbek Communist Party Central Committee and Dizdarevic, Yugoslav federal secretary for foreign affairs, took place in Tashkent today. The guest was familiarized with the course of preparations for the 27th CPSU Congress, the economic and social development of the republic, and tasks of accelerating scientific and technological progress, and raising the efficiency and quality of output produced.

Dizdarevic emphasized the important significance of the talks held in Moscow for further deepening friendship and mutual understanding and for developing fruitful cooperation between the two countries. He positively appraised the results that have been attained in bilateral relations.

The guest also had a conversation in the Uzbek Council of Ministers. Also, Dizdarevic arrived in Samarkand today, where he saw the historic and architectural monuments of this ancient town.

TV Interviews Dizdarevic

LD12225 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 12 Jan 86

[Video "interview" with SFRY Federal Secretary for Foreign Affairs Raif Dizdarevic before his departure from the USSR; Dizdarevic recorded in Serbo-Croatian with superimposed Russian translation date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Dizdarevic] The talks in Moscow were very meaningful [soderzhatelnyy] and fruitful. They passed, as customary, in an atmosphere of friendship, sincerity, and mutual respect. They were directed toward finding ways of further deepening cooperation between the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia in all spheres. Both sides expressed readiness to develop our cooperation in the future on the same principles that formed the basis of the Belgrade Declaration.

I think that the traditional friendship and mutual understanding between our peoples is continually being strengthened.

A broad exchange of opinions on topical international problems also took place. We examined the problems of the fight for peace and disarmament, the lessening of international tension, and equal international cooperation. In such a short time, we were able to satisfy ourselves about how successfully your country is preparing itself for the 27th CPSU Congress. I want to wish the Soviet people success in this and success in general in socialist construction in the Soviet Union. In conclusion, I would like to thank you for the cordial reception in Moscow and Uzbekistan, were we have just been.

Comparison of Shevardnadze Talks

Moscow PRAVDA in Russian on 11 January in its First Edition on page 4 carries a TASS report on the talks held between Foreign Minister E.A. Shevardnadze and Yugoslavia's Raif Dizdarevic. The PRAVDA report, appearing under the general heading "In an Atmosphere of Friendship and Mutual Understanding," has been compared with the Moscow TASS English version published under the subheading "Political Contacts 'Expand'" in the 10 January Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page F2, revealing the following variations:

In the first paragraph, first line, PRAVDA reads: [Text] Talks ended here 9 January between member of... (omitting TASS dateline, substituting "9 January" for "today"]

In the second paragraph, penultimate line, PRAVDA reads: ...and technical cooperation has reached a high... (clarifying word as received);

On page F 3, penultimate paragraph, first line, PRAVDA reads: ...the international situation and its growing role... (substituting "and" for comma).

ARKHIPOV ARRIVES IN FINLAND, RECEIVED BY KOIVISTO

LD131023 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1012 GMT 13 Jan 86

[Text] Helsinki, 13 Jan (TASS) -- President Mauno Koivisto of the Finnish Republic today received Ivan Arkhipov, chairman of the Soviet part of the Standing Intergovermental Soviet-Finnish Commission for Economic Cooperation and first deputy chairman the USSR Council of Minister, who has arrived here for a meeting between the cochairmen of the commission.

During a conversation, held in a friendly atmosphere, questions regarding the further expansion of Soviet-Finnish trade and commercial-economic cooperation were discussed.

PONOMAREV, ZAGLADIN MEET SAN MARINO PARTY LEADER

LD101820 Moscow TASS in English 1719 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] Moscow,January 10 TASS -- Boris Ponomarev, an alternate member of the Politbureau and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Vadim Zagladin, a member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy head of the International Department of the CPSU Central Committee, today had a conversation with Gilberto Ghiotti, general secretary of the San Marino Communist Party.

Boris Ponomarev informed Gilberto Ghiotti of preparations for the 27 CPSU Congress and the nationwide discussion of the draft new edition of the CPSU Programme, draft changes in the party rules and the draft guidelines for the economic and social development of the USSR for 1986-1990 and to the year 2000, and also of the CPSU's position on international issues.

The general secretary of the San Marino Communist Party described preparations for the 11th party congress, the activities of the San Marino Communists in the country and in the government of the left forces, and the struggle waged by them for peace and disarmament.

The representatives of the two parties spoke in favour of preventing an arms race in outer space and ending it on earth and for ending all nuclear explosions. The accords reached in Geneva should be translated into practical deeds.

The conversation passed in a friendly atmosphere that is characteristic of relations between the two parties.

TASS NOTES REACTION TO U.S. SANCTIONS ON LIBYA

UK Not To Participate

LD102021 Moscow TASS in English 1825 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] London January 10 TASS-- Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher of Britain has stated that Britain will not join the U.S.-announced sanctions against Libya. She made the statement during a meeting with U.S. correspondents accredited in London. Neither did Thatcher support Washington's military threats to Libya. The head of the Conservative cabinet, who, as a rule, declares in support to the USA's international course, made it clear that, in her view, U.S. military action with regard to that country would be a breach of international law.

Spanish Communist Party Comments

LD102151 Moscow TASS in English 2122 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] Madrid January 10 TASS -- The Communist Party of Spain points out the possibility of the use by the United States of its military bases in Spanish territory in operations against the sovereign people of Libya. The American military bases at Rota and Torrejon de Ardoz in Spanish territory, the Communist Party says in a statement released by it, are not controlled by the Spanish Government.

The communist party calls upon the Spanish Government to prevent the use of national territory for an act of aggression against Libya.

Athens Demonstrations

LD102202 Moscow TASS in English 2117 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] Athens January 10 TASS -- The Greek capital has been the scene of a mass demonstration in protest against the anti-Libyan campaign launched by Washington. The protestors marched to the building housing the U.S. Embassy in Athens chanting "hands off Libya" and "no sanctions against Libya". They denounced Washington's attempts to put pressure on that country by economic blackmail and to spill the situation in the Mediterranean. A proclamation circulated among the marchers, accuses Washington of pursuing the policy of state terrorism.

Turkish Paper Cited

LD122235 Moscow TASS in English 2129 GMT 12 Jan 86

[Text] Istanbul Janaury 12 TASS -- Prime Minister Turgut Ozal of Turkey has emphasised that his country has good long-term relations with Libya. It is from this point of view, the prime minister stated when answering journalists' questions, that Turkey will approach everything concerning that country.

The Istanbul newspaper MILLIYET, in its commentary on the anti-Libyan campaign launched by the United States, queries: "Where is the true source of terrorism? Can the Palestinian people, driven away from their own lands which are now under the yoke of occupation be described as terrorists? Or those who struggle against the Israeli invaders and their patrons? Or the struggle of the black majority in South Africa?"

"By the logic of the United States, Israel and their followers, all those are terrorists. This time Libya has been chosen as the main target for a strike. The terrorist activities of U.S. and Israeli secret services have added the bloodiest pages to the world violence record. Coups planned by the CIA and wars unleashed by secret services have resulted in the death of hundreds of thousands and millions of people", MILLIYET writes. "Such things as deception, bribery and oppression are not even regarded by them as forms of terror".

"All states which come out against terrorism must side with Libya in the face of rude and mean attacks. It does not become the peoples of the world to take lessons in 'anti-terrorism' from the most inveterate terrorists -- the USA and Israel", the newspaper stresses.

AUSTRIAN STATEMENT ON MIDDLE EAST POLICY NOTED

LD101337 Moscow TASS in English 1215 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] Vienna, January 10 TASS -- The Austrian Government expressed support for the policy of peaceful settlement in the Middle East. A government statement issued here today stresses that such a settlement should include the guarantee of the national rights of the people of Palestine, including its right to the establishment of its own sovereign state and the recongition of the Palestine Liberation Organization as the representative of the Palestinian people.

The government of Austria also makes note of the need of recognizing the right of all states of that region, including Israel, to the "existence within the guaranteed borders." In this connection the Austrian Government makes a demand on the withdrawal of Israel from all territories occupied by it since 1967."

REACTION TO UK DEFENSE SECRETARY'S RESIGNATION

IZVESTIYA Comments

PM111838 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 1

[V. Mikheyev "Pertinent Remarks" : "M. Heseltine 'Slammed the Door'"]

[Text] The first session of M. Thatcher's cabinet this year ended with British Defense Secretary Michael Heseltine announcing his resignation.

In the opinion of commentators, M. Heseltine was forced to "slam the door" because of a conflict that had become extremely exacerbated over Westland, the country's only helicopter-building company, which is in deep trouble.

Finding itself on the brink of ruin, let us recall, the firm received several "rescue" offers. The American Sikorsky Aircraft Corperation and a consortium of European companies Messerchmitt-Boelkow-Blohm, and Britain's British Aerospace Corperation and General Electric Company enrered the fray with the desire of acquiring an impressive package of the firm's shares.

M. Heseltine was a vigorous advocate of the European firms: He emphasized in his speeches that allowing American capital to penetrate beneath the roof of the British company, as REUTER points out, "will deprive Britain of an independent helicopter-building industry."

Pro-American cabinet members took up arms against M. Heseltine. And not the least role, London commentators point out, was played by Prime Minister M. Thatcher's stance. . . . M. Heseltine is a prominent figure in the conservative camp. He has frequently been called a potential future party leader. Therefore his departure has provoked the most painful government crisis in 6 years of Tory rule. Many people believe, as is clear from BBC commentaries, that once on the back benches in the House of Commons (the front benches are reserved for cabinet members) M. Heseltine will become a dangerous critic of the government's actions.

PRAVDA Notes Resignation

PM101916 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 86 First Edition p 5

[TASS report: "M. Heseltine's Resignation"]

[Text] London, 10 Jan -- British Defense Secretary M. Heseltine announced his resignation yesterday. This decision was brought about by a major political conflict in Britain in connection with the fate of Westland, the country's helicopter manufacturing firm. This company was on the brink of financial bankruptcy, and ministers, numerous Conservative MP's, and representatives of business circles have been involved in the quarrel about how its problems should be resolved.

Actually, it is a question of a clash between the interests of two monopoly groupin Last year the U.S. Sikorsky Aircraft Corporation offered "to give financial assistance" to the company. At the same time, a consortium of West European firms put forward its own "rescue plan" for Westland.

While M Heseltine pressed for the adoption of the "European plan," the cabinet adopted a decision according to which the leadership of Westland is also free to accept the leadership of Sikorsky Aircraft Company's offer.

G. Younger, former secretary of state for Scotland has been appointed defense secretary.

IZVESTIYA VIEWS DIALOGUE ON NETHERLANDS MISSILES

PM101157 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 10 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 5

[Political observer Stanislav Kondrashov article: "Importance of Dialogue"]

[Text] Among the important unresolved problems that the new year has inherited from the old there remains the problem of nuclear arms in Europe -- and the task of lowering nuclear confrontation on the continent, which is not called a nuclear powder keg for nothing. If we take the dynamics of "Missile" figures, last year revealed two opposing trends. The Soviet Union first announced a moratorium on the deployment of new SS-20 missiles which had been additionally deployed in response to the deployment of American medium-range missiles in West Europe. As a result of that reduction, the number of SS-20 (243 in all) in the European zone was reduced to the level that existed in June 1984. The stationary structures for the deployment of the missiles removed were dismantled.

On the other side -- the U.S. and NATO side -- the curve rose steadily last year. According to official Pentagon data, today 236 American medium-range nuclear missiles are deployed in West Europe, including all 108 of the Pershing-2's envisaged by NATO's "two-track decision" of December 1979. And, as is well known, Britain and France also have their own nuclear missiles.

As is known, this very acute European political problem was on the agenda of the Soviet-American talks that started in Geneva last March and are soon to be resumed. Unfortunately, no real progress toward an accord was registered. Some hope is now pinned on the Geneva summit meeting. In the Soviet-American joint statement on its results, the sides advocated that the speediest progress be made in those spheres where there are points of contact, mentioning here this idea of an interim agreement on medium-range missiles in Europe.

The Soviet Union has done a great deal to breathe new life into these talks and to give them the prospect of a successful outcome. Let us recall that Soviet foreign policy initiatives last year included a proposal to conclude an agreement on the question of nuclear arms in Europe separately, with no direct link to the problem of space and strategic arms. In its search for a solution to the problem the Soviet Union also invited Britain and France to a direct conversation in order to discuss, taking mutual interests into account, the place of their nuclear potential in the European balance of forces.

Only unscrupulous people or the most inveterate skeptics could cast doubt on the sincerity and intensiveness of the Soviet efforts to pursue the aim of lessening the danger of war in Europe. We invite everyone to a constructive dialogue, proceeding from the premise that Europe is our common home. We are prepared to give everyone a hearing. And in the context of the Soviet peace-loving effort the question of reciprocity, of movement toward the West European states, and of the participation in and contribution of each of them to resolving the common task of improving the international and European situation is arising with ever greater urgency.

I would like to dwell on the attitude of the Netherlands and its government to this dialogue.

The Netherlands resisted the missile deployment plans longer than the others. According to the NATO plan drawn up back at the end of 1979, 48 American cruise missiles were "put down" to this small country, but a country proud of its independent character. The Dutch spent 6 years fighting the plans off. The population was opposed to "defenders" who attract nuclear danger like a magnet. The government could not disregard the will of the people, who, as polls showed, rejected the transatlantic gifts by approximately two-thirds of the adult population's votes and appended approximately 4 million signatures to corresponding petitions -- an unprecedented knot of protest for a country with 14 million inhabitants.

Since the Dutch so clearly preferred common sense to the fetish of blind Atlantic solidarity, the right-centrist coalition government of R. Lubbers long delayed the moment of decision, despite pressure from the senior NATO partner. However, outside pressure still overcame protest within the country. On 1 November 1985 the government nonetheless adopted the regrettable decision to deploy American missiles. Parliament is now debating the question of an American-Dutch agreement on this score, and the debate is expected to end in a few weeks. Toward the end of 1988 American Tomahawks will arrive at an air base near the small town of Woensdrecht.

Trying to substantiate the missile decision, Prime Minister R. Lubbers voiced the opinion that his government's policy, "in the form in which it was pursued, at a certain level and to a certain degree, had a positive impact on the international climate." He added: "We managed to avoid escalation," Permit me to ask: What escalation? Does not consent to the deployment of American missiles in the Netherlands mean the escalation both of military confrontation in Europe and, correspondingly, of the danger of war?!

Of course, the dogged resistance of the Dutch to the dangerous plans was noted and assessed, but their government's contribution to improving the European situation would have been incontestable if it had not been hasty over the American missiles, had made better use of the potential of the Dutch-Soviet dialogue, and had made a constructive assessment of the qualitatively new situation created by the broad package of Soviet proposals which open the way to a substantial reduction in medium-range nuclear means in Europe.

We have already mentioned an important new element of the Soviet proposals -- the idea of concluding a separate agreement on these arms, independently of space and strategic arms.

The Dutch side made it a condition for refunding American missiles that the number of Soviet missiles should not rise above the June 1984 level. The Soviet Union took that condition into consideration with regard to the European zone, and that at a time when the number of similar American means in West Europe had more than quadrupled.

Did that not merit corresponding attention on the part of The Hague?

True, in defining the conditions for adopting the decision on the American Tomahawks, the Lubbers government also raised the question of Soviet missiles in Asia. However, that question was dragged up artificially. It has no bearing on the Eurostrategic balance or the Netherlands' security interests. The Soviet Union neither had nor has any intention of transferring the missiles removed from the European zone to the Asian part. In addition, in order to remain within the framework of their chosen logic, the Dutch leaders could have extended their concern over the mobility of the SS-20 missile also to the American Pershings and Tomahawks. Because they are no less mobile, and if, as skeptics believe, Soviet missiles are being kept in Asia for instantaneous transfer, if necessary, to Europe, then why not -- according to the same logic and for the same purpose -- keep American missiles on the other side of the ocean?

The unrealistic, inflexible conditions formulated by The Hague in June 1984 proved to be a kind of delayed-action ultimatum which the Netherlands Government issued to itself and fulfilled on 1 November last year. Then some people in The Hague evidently decided to consider the dialogue between our two countries closed. Meanwhile, the favorable opportunities for it have by no means been exhausted. At any rate, Moscow advocates maintaining a serious dialogue with the Netherlands on questions of security and medium-range nuclear means in Europe. Particularly now, after the agreement reached at the highest level in Geneva that work at the Soviet-American talks on nuclear and space arms will be accelerated, it is important not to be hasty over adopting decisions that might not improve but worsen the prospects for reaching mutually acceptable accords. It is important to continue the search for mutual understanding.

VOROTNIKOV HOLDS TALKS WITH FRENCH AMBASSADOR

LD102334 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1800 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Announcer-read report from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] Comrade Vorotnikov today received the French ambassador in the USSR, Raimond, at the latter's request. A friendly conversation took place, in which a number of questions concerning Soviet-French relations and the current international situation were touched upon.

USSR AMBASSADOR CLARIFIES POLICY ON LIBYA

LD111348 Tripoli Voice of Greater Arab Homeland in Arabic 1250 GMT 11 Jan 86

[Interview with unnamed USSR ambassador to Libya on the "Today's Report" program by unidentified interviewer; the ambassador speaks in Arabic -- recorded]

[Text] Several days ago, the USSR announced that it will not stand with tied hands in the face of U.S. imposed sanctions against Libya. A senior Soviet Foreign Ministry official stated that Moscow will continue to support the Jamahiriyah in the face of U.S. state terrorism. TASS said that these threats pose a serious threat not only to Libya, but also to the other countries in the Mediterranean and constitute a shake-up of the situation in this part of the world. TASS accused the U.S. Government of preparing an aggressive military action against the Jamahiriyah with the Zionist enemy. It affirmed the USSR's support for the Libyan Arab people in their bold stand against U.S. threats and said that the USSR, while supporting the Libyan people, most firmly condemns the hostile campaign being waged by the United States and the Zionists against Libya -- the economic sanctions and preparations -- and that such actions cannot be described as a cause for threatening peace and security in and outside the Mediterranean basin.

To further elucidate the Soviet Union's position, Tripoli Voice of Greater Arab Homeland [VOGAH] radio just interviewed the USSR ambassador in the Jamahiriyah [not further identified] who said:

[USSR envoy] I thank VOGAH for this interview. I want to speak about the Soviet Union's attitude on the present tense situation in the Mediterranean in relation to U.S. and Zionist threats against the friendly Jamahiriyah.

In fact, the Soviet Government has, through the official Soviet Government news agency TASS and the statements of senior Soviet Foreign Ministry officials, clearly expressed the views of the Soviet Government and people about present conditions.

I can assure you that the Soviet people, or the USSR as people, government and party, denounce the U.S. threats to the friendly Jamahiriyah and the friendly Libyan Arab people.

We consider U.S. behavior and the attempts to pressure the Jamahiriyah -- that Arab independent state which enjoys respect in the Arab and international arenas -- as a matter which is not [word indistinct] in the present conditions. The USSR, in its capacity as a friend of the Arabs and the friend of all the world liberation movements stands alongside the Libyan Arab people and the peoples and command in the Jamahiriyah and all the Arab peoples.

[Question] We are not asking about the USSR position, because it is clear and well-known and derives its roots from history favoring the Arabs. Our question is whether the USSR would permit itself to sit on the fence with mere denunciation in case there is further escalation of the situation by the United States on the road to war. What will the USSR position be?

[Answer] We cannot now say what will happen if this occurs. However, we can assure you that we are your friends now and we are doing everything to help and support the Jamahiriyah people. I can say to you that we are in constant contact with the Jamahiriyah leadership to study the current situation. I am sure that we will not stand idly by or sit on the fence should events develop further.

[Question] As you see, U.S. fleets are roaming the Mediterranean. This, of course, constitutes aggression and provocation because the Mediterranean is thousands of miles from U.S. shores. What is the USSR's opinion or rather how does the USSR evaluate the call made by the brother commander of the revolution for clearing the Mediterranean of all fleets?

[Answer] I can say that in principle, we are against military presence in the Mediterranean. In fact, we support the idea of the brother commander as expressed during his meeting with Comrade Mikhail Gorbachev in Moscow during his official visit to the USSR that all foreign fleets should be removed from the Mediterranean and all military bases should be abolished. We support the views of the brother commander concerning the transformation of the Mediterranean into a sea of cooperation, trade, international cooperation, peace, and security. We support this idea and we can go as far as to say that both internationally and regionally we have been cooperating with the Jamahiriyah to translate this idea into actions.

[Question] At his news conference recently, the brother commander said that by its provocation and transgression, the United States has provided us with an opportunity to work more earnestly and with greater determination to realize Arab unity and that we will ally ourselves with West Europe, -- anti-imperialist West European movements -- thus creating what we can call a bloc or quarter or side or front in the Mediterranean between the Arab nation and Europe. What are Soviet views on this matter?

[Answer] In fact, we always welcome any step forward on the road of Arab world cooperation within whatever framework; be it the framework of the Mediterranean, East or West Europe, or the Arab world. As regards Arab unity we can say to you that we always call for the closing of the ranks and for the unity of Arab action because only in conditions of Arab unity, can the Arabs overcome their problems and the common enemy.

With regard to the bloc of West Europe, the Arabs, North Africa -- naturally this matter concerns the peoples of the region. Anyway, if this regional cooperation could help solve the cause of peace and ensure security and stability in this region, then we the USSR will always welcome such a thing, because the aim of our foreign policy is the establishment of peace and security in the world.

[Question] The USSR is a superpower. Yet, the United States also tries to provoke the USSR. The installation of the missiles in West Europe and the concentration of forces in West Europe are no more than attempts to provoke the USSR. Do you not believe that the U.S. attitude which is hostile to the USSR and the Arabs constitutes a basic point in the unity of stands of the Arab nation and the USSR against U.S. imperialism?

[Answer] Not only that. The element of the conflict of U.S. imperialism, or of some of the U.S. circles against the USSR and the Arabs are indeed there. This is only one element. At the same time, we can say that there are some common interests between the Arabs and the USSR. I mean by this cooperation for peace in this region, cooperation for the sake of development of the Arab homeland economically, socially and culturally. We can say that the history of the Arab-Soviet cooperation is very long. We are happy that we can cooperate with the Arabs and help them in implementing their development projects and programs and to be the true friends so that we may together march toward social progress and international cooperation.

[Question] The United States and the so-called Israel -- we the Arabs consider the Zionism and the so-called Israel as our enemies -- describe the Palestinian Arab struggle as terrorism. How does the USSR view this situation and this blustering?

[Answer] We consider and support the struggle of the Palestine Arab people for their legitimate rights as a just struggle. We support it.

As you know, the PLO has a representative office in Moscow. We cooperate with the organization [words indistinct] and its groups in good matters. As for Israel, it carries out acts of terrorism as a terrorist state against the Arabs. In this regard we have numerous documents and events of strikes on Lebanese villages in southern Lebanon, Syria, the Palestinians in the occupied territory, or even attack on the PLO in Tunis which is over 2000 kms away. We consider Israel, with U.S. support, practices terrorism (?politically).

[Question] Is there anything else you want to say?

[Answer] I want to thank you very much. I want to point out that we are very anxious to develop relations with the Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah. We point out that last year witnessed a very major event which bears on the development of these relations: the visit to the USSR by the brother commander of the Great 1 September Revolution and his meeting with Comrade Gorbachev. I can say that we do all that we can to develop relations with you. Our position in the current critical conditions of the Jamahiriyah, is not a strange one. It is the attitude of a friend who always stands by the side of the Libyan Arab people and the other Arab peoples. Thank you.

LIBYA'S AL-TURAYKI CITED ON SOVIET SUPPORT

LD121056 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 12 Jan 86

[Text] In an interview with a TASS correspondent, Secretary of the Libyan People's Bureau for Foreign Liaison Al-Turayki has stated that the United States is pursuing a policy of state terrorism against independent developing countries that reject the imperialist diktat. He stressed that U.S. imperialism's economic sanctions will fail to undermine the Libyan revolution and even less be able to destroy it and chance the anti-imperialist orientation of Libya's foreign policy and its internal socialist policies. Al-Turayki noted that Libya welcomes the support being extended by the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and by all peace-loving forces.

U.S. 'MASSIVE PRESSURE' AGAINST LIBYA REMAINS

LD101035 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 0330 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Excerpt] The world is anxiously following the events surrounding Libya, which has become the target of massive U.S. pressure. The threat of U.S. aggression against this Arab country remains. Several dozen U.S. warships, lead by the carrier "Coral Sea," are now concentrated close to Libyan shores. Libyan government property and assets in the United States have been seized on President Reagan's orders. Earlier, Washington broke off trading links with that country. It is demanding that its allies join in the anti-Libyan economic sanctions. However, the international reaction to these demands is bringing the White House no pleasure.

ISLAMIC COUNTRIES URGE 'ACTIVE HELP' FOR LIBYA

LD121137 Moscow International Service in French to the Maghreb Countries 2030 GMT 11 Jan 86

[From the "Window on the Arab World" program presented by Aleksandr Timoshkin]

[Text] In an interview given by President Reagan on Friday to five West European journalists, he said that the U.S. allies still have time to unite so as to isolate Al-Qadhdhafi. To the U.S. President, the leader of the Libyan Jamahiriyah is an outlaw who has openly pit himself against the whole world. The head of the White House uttered many a nice word on ethics and on the need to protect moral principles from terrorists, all for the sole aim of justifying the crude pressure campaign against Libya launched by U.S. ruling circles, our commentator Aleksandr Timoshkin writes.

The question is not just one of criminal interference by U.S. imperialists in the affairs of the sovereign Libyan state; it is also a question of eliminating its leaders. For example, senator Metzenbaum has declared without any ambiguity: Colonel Al-Qadhdhafi absolutely must be killed. This is the moral of U.S. imperialism that seeks world domination. Let us recall for our listeners that the CIA and other U.S. special services have laid down detailed plans for the suppression of Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi and other Libyan leaders. These plans have been approved by the White House.

As is known in Washington, U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Whitehead is going to West Europe to persuade the NATO allies to join the sanctions against Libya. [Words indistinct] reprisals on behalf of NATO solidarity. It is known that West Eruope has had rather a lukewarm welcome to the U.S. anti-Libyan campaign. Even Great Britain, their most loyal NATO ally, has refused to join the anti-Libyan sanctions.

It is significant that the seizure of Libyan assets in U.S. banks has aroused a sharp concern in transatlantic financial circles who fear that, in retaliation, other Arab states will withdraw their very considerable deposits from U.S. banks, which would deal a painful blow to the U.S. financial system and economy.

The United States is once again playing the role of world gendarme, said Carlos [name indistinct], secretary general of the Socialist Party of Puerto Rico. His statement expresses the international reaction to the neocolonialist measures taken by Washington against the Libyan Jamahiriyah. Meanwhile, the Islamic Conference Organization (ICO) ministerial conference in Fes has adopted a special resolution strongly condemning the subversive campaign launched by U.S. imperialism and its Israeli ally against Libya.

Many Islamic countries believe that support and active help must be extended to Libya which energetically confronts the [word indistinct] greed of neocolonialist Yankees. Also, the Arab League member countries that took part in the Fes conference have decided to convene an extraordinary session of the Arab foreign ministers. They will meet in the next few days. The Arab states intend to adopt collective measures to face up to Washington's criminal policy which harms their freedom, sovereignty and national independence.

One must say, our commentator Aleksandr Timoshkin writes, that the situation in the Middle East has long been the focus of attention of the Islamic countries' delegates to the Fes conference. In particular they come out in support of calling for an international conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all concerned, including the PLO. They have reaffirmed that, as far as the Islamic countries are concerned, the PLO is the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people.

Let us also note that the Fes conference has condemned Israel which continues its aggression in Lebanon. The results of the ICO ministerial conference enable us to affirm that the imperialist west and its associates have suffered a fiasco in their attempt to impose on this influential organization debates of irrelevant problems that have nothing to do with the objectives and tasks of the ICO, our commentator says.

AL-QADHDHAFI DEFENDS CAUSE OF PALESTINIANS

LD101741 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1300 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] Tripoli -- Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi, the Libyan leader has stated at a press conference that the campaign of threats and military blackmail against Libya unleashed by Washington and its ally Israel is the latest manifestation of a policy of state terrorism. Libya, like other Arab countries, al-Qadhdhafi went on, does not wish to submit to the U.S.-Israel diktat. In accordance with the UN Charter, Libya is prepared to make use of its right to self-defense. As for the economic sanctions, they are doomed to failure, and can do no harm to anyone except perhaps the Americans themselves, who in accordance with Reagan's order, will wish [as heard] to leave Libya.

Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi also rejected the attempts to present the struggle of the Palestinian people to attain their legitimate rights as terrorism. The United States, threatening the use of armed force, is endeavoring to punish all who raise their voices in defense of the Palestinians and all who strive to uphold the right of the Arab peoples to a life of peace. Al-Qadhdhafi reaffirmed his country's readiness to continue rendering all-round support to the Palestinians in their struggle to attain their legitimate national rights, including the right to establish their own independent state.

Washington, Mu'ammar al-Qadhdhafi continued, is lending complete and unconditional support to Israel and equipping it with U.S. armaments, which are used against the Arabs. It was with U.S. aid that Israeli aircraft bombed the Tunisian capital, and it was with U.S. aid that the raid on the Yemeni Arab Republic is being prepared. The Libyan leader reported that, in the course of contacts with leaders of Arab countries, an accord was reached on convening an emergency session of the Arab League in Tunis, at the level of foreign ministers, to study the question of U.S.-Arab relations.

U.S. POLICY TOWARD LIBYA 'STATE TERRORISM'

LD101540 Moscow World Service in English 1410 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Station commentary]

[Text] The situation in the Mediterranean Sea area has sharply aggravated in the last few days. The United States has intensified its campaign of threats to Libya. American warships have been moved to Libyan shores. The American ally, Israel, is openly preparing for aggressive actions. Why has this campaign been launched? Here is our comment:

Recent tragic developments at the Rome and Vienna airports, where unidentified persons committed acts of terrorism, were used as a pretext for the campaign. Attempts are made to put the blame for them on Libya. Libya's official statements to that effect [as heard], including the letter sent to the United Nations secretary general, are deliberately ignored by the United States.

Yet Washington has no evidence at its disposal. But this does not prevent it from claiming that the peaceful sovereign Arab state of Libya poses a threat to the national security of the United States. Along with that claim, the United States has launched a real economic aggression against Libya. American official spokesmen said more decisive actions would be undertaken soon; military actions in other words.

It's an undeniable truth that terrorism of any kind should be condemned. This was and is the Soviet Union's view of the problem. It was reaffirmed in a statement on the situation in the Mediterranean Sea area issued by the Soviet news agency TASS on 9 January. The statement points to the necessity of joining the efforts of the entire international community to put an end once and for all to acts of terrorism causing senseless deaths and hindering the normal progress of international contacts. But the responsibility for the rampage of terrorist activities in the world rests in effect not with the Arab states pursuing an independent policy but with those who, by making terrorism their state policy, trample upon the legitimate rights and interests of sovereign states and peoples. This is the policy that the United States (?has) been pursuing, in particular in relation to Libya. In fact it started pursuing it shortly after the removal by the Libyans of the American military bases from their territory 15 years ago.

The American and Israeli threats are now spearheaded against Libya, but the large-scale military preparations of the two strategic allies constitute a threat to other countries and destabilize the situation in the Mediterranean Sea area. The statement of the Soviet News Agency TASS points out that the Soviet Union strongly condemns the actions taken by the United States and Israel and voices its support for the Libyan people. The Soviet leaders hope that a sober understanding of the existing realities will take the upper hand in the United States, and that it will weigh up seriously the dangerous consequences to which the continuation of its policy towards the sovereign Libyan state may lead. They also hope that the United States will not only display the restraint expected from it by the peoples of the world but will also call to order its arrogant partner, Israel.

MOVEMENT OF SOLIDARITY WITH LIBYA EXPANDING

LD122250 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1930 GMT 12 Jan 86

[Yevgeniy Lukyanov report]

[Text] A movement of solidarity with Libya, in its warding off U.S. threats and blackmail, is expanding in the countries of the Arab east and the African Continent. Our correspondent on North African countries Yevgeniy Lukyanov reports:

The ministers of foreign affairs of the Arab League have decided on calling an extraordinary session of this organization's council in Tunis at the end of this month in order to discuss U.S. economic sanctions against the Libyan Jamahiriyah and the development of necessary measures for opposing them. The Arab monetary fund, on its part, has resolutely condemned the freezing of Libyan assets in U.S. banks, assessing this new step in the crusade unleashed by the Washington Administration against Libya as a violation of the standards of international law.

In connection with this, the Arab press is calling upon the Arab states to respond to the White House's economic aggression by withdrawing their assets from U.S. banks. The immediate abolition of the economic sanctions against Libya was required by the Islamic Conference Organization at the session of the foreign ministers of the countries of this organization which has ended now.

Serious concern in the Arab world and on the African Continent also is being provoked by the military preparations by Washington in the Mediterranean region, in the immediate vicinity of the Libyan coasts and its threats to use military force against Libya. In its special statement, the General Secretariat of the OAU, is stressing that the hostile actions against Libya by the United States will have extraordinarily dangerous consequences both for the region and for the whole world. The anti-Libyan campaign unleashed by Washington which threatens independence and sovereignty of the republic has been condemned by Mauritania and Burkina Faso, who stated their solidarity with the Libyan people in its warding off the imperialist plot.

PLO CHARGE D'AFFAIRE'S PRESS CONFERENCE REPORTED

LD091849 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian 1730 GMT 9 Jan 86

[Text] In Moscow today a press conference was given by Rami Muhammad al-Sha'ir, PLO charge d'affaires in the USSR. Our correspondent Aleksandr Levchenko reports:

The press conference was devoted to the situation in the Near East, which has deteriorated sharply as a consequence of the anti-Libyan campaign unleashed by Washington. In his address to journalists, the PLO representative said, in particular:

[Begin Al-Sha'ir recording in Arabic, with superimposed Russian translation] Libya is resol and consistently resisting the U.S. policy of interference in the affairs of Arab countries, the Washington-Tel-Aviv alliance, and acts of international terrorism. Libya's anti-imperialist course and its growing influence in the Arab world are what makes this country the target of the terrorist activity of imperialism and Zionism. Thus all the acts of blackmail, sabotage and saber rattling which we are witnessing today. [end recording]

Among Palestinians calling for a just and honest resolution of the Near East conflict, Rami al-Sha'ir stressed, it has been stated perfectly clearly that acts discrediting the PLO and the Arab liberation movement as a whole are carried out by enemies of the Palestinian people.

Salim Huwaydi, member of the People's Committee [as heard] of the People's Bureau of the Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriyah in the USSR, also took part in the press conference. He thanked the Soviet public for its manifestation of solidarity with the Libyan people. Then Salim Huwaydi made this statement:

[Begin Huwaydi recording in Arabic, with superimposed Russian translation] We stress that Libya is not a source of terrorism. We reject it. The U.S. military and economic threats will have no effect upon us. We shall not be intimidated. The people of the Libyan Jamahiriyah will steadfastly continue the struggle. [end recording]

IZVESTIYA Report

PM101731 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 Jan 86 Morning Edition p 4

[Unattributed Report: "Condemnation of Provocation"]

[Text] "It is patently obvious that the Israeli and U.S. special services planned and carried out the terrorist actions at Rome and Vienna airports in order to use them as the pretext for pressuring the Arab countries, primarily Libya and Syria," Rami Muhammad al-Sha'ir, PLO charge d'affaires in Moscow, stated at a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists.

While ascribing responsibility for these actions to Libya, the Pentagon is building up its strike forces near that sovereign Arab country's borders and threatening to launch armed aggression against it at any moment. At the same time Israel -- America's strategic ally -- has brazenly declared its intention to launch a strike against Syria.

"On the pretext of combating international terrorism, Washington and Tel Aviv have repeatedly inflamed hostile campaigns against Arab countries and the Palestine resistance movement. Their aim is to undermine Arab unity in the struggle against Israeli expansion and weaken the Palestinian People's forces. This is not the first time the first time the United States and Israel have conducted such provocative actions. Tel Aviv used the attempt on the life of Shlomo Argov, Israeli ambassador to Britain, as the pretext for aggression against Lebanon and the annihilation of tens of thousands of peaceful Lebanese and Palestinians," the Palestinian representative noted.

"In fueling tension around Libya, Syria, and Lebanon the Israeli aggressors and their transoceanic protectors are also pursuing another goal: diverting the world community's attention from the resolution of the Palestinian problem -- the central problem of the Near East Conflict -- without which peace in the region is impossible," Al-Sha'ir stressed.

ENVOY INFORMS KUWAIT OF OPPOSITION TO SANCTIONS

LD111356 Kuwait KUNA in English 1233 GMT 11 Jan 86

[Text] Kuwait, Jan 11 (KUNA) -- The Soviet Union Saturday officially informed Kuwait of its opoosition to the United States' imposition of punitive measures and economic sanctions against Libya. A spokesman of the Foreign Ministry said the Soviet ambassador to Kuwait Pogos Akopov conveyed his country's stance during a meeting with the undersecretary Sulayman Majid al-Shahin at the Foreign Ministry today. Akopov, according to the spokesman, briefed the undersecretary of the statement issued by Moscow in this connection. President Ronald Reagan of the United States has imposed economic sanctions on Libya and ordered a freeze on its assets at the American banks and their overseas branches and urged his European allies to follow suit. The American measures against Libya have been taken for Tripoli's alleged becking of terrorism specially the December 27 attack at El Al counters at Rome and Vienna airports.

GOVOROV RECEIVED BY KUWAITI DEFENSE MINISTER

LD121246 Moscow TASS in English 1130 GMT 12 Jan 86

[Text] Kuwait, January 12 TASS -- General of the Army V.L. Govorov, deputy defence minister of the USSR, who arrived on an official visit to Kuwait on Saturday, was received by Defence Minister Shaykh Salim al-Sabah al-Salim al-Sabah. In the course of their conversation the sides discussed Soviet-Kuwaiti relations and ways of their further development and expansion.

RYZHKOV, SHEVARDNADZE MEET MALAGASY OFFICIALS

PM111846 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 Jan 86 First Edition p 1

[TASS Report: "Meeting in the Kremlin"]

[Text] CPSU Central Committee Politburo member Nikolay Ryzhkov, USSR Council of Ministers chairman and CPSU Central Committee Politburo member Eduard Shevardnadze, USSR foreign minister, received in the Kremlin 9 January the special envoys of the president of the Democratic Republic of Madagascar, Minister of Revolutionary Art and Culture Gisele Rabesahala, secretary general of the Congress Party for Madagascar independence, and Minister of Commerce Georges Solofonson, member of the Central Committee of the vanguard of the Malagasy Revolution Party, who handed over a personal message from President Didier Ratsiraka addressed to the Soviet leadership. During a conversation which took place in a warm, friendly atmosphere, questions pertaining to the development of bilateral Soviet-Malagasy relations, as well as certain topical international problems, were discussed.

PONOMAREV, MALI OFFICIAL HOLD CONVERSATION

LD091937 Moscow Television Service in Russian 1656 GMT 9 Jan 86

[Text] Comrade Ponomarev today received Diarra, Mali People's Democratic Union deputy general secretary and minister of state, who has arrived in the USSR as a representative of Moussa Traore, that union's general secretary and president of the Republic of Mali. Diarra handed over a message from Traore for Mikhail Sergeyevich Gorbachev. A friendly conversation took place during which questions of mutual interest were discussed. The meeting's participants expressed themselves in favor of further developing cooperation.

NEW AMBASSADOR TO SOMALIA APPOINTED

PM071513 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 5 Jan 86 Second Edition p 6

[Unattributed "Diary" report]

[Text] The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has appointed Comrade Bakhadyr Abbasovich Abdurazakov ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Somali Democratic Republic. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium has released Comrade Boris Ivanovich Ilichev from his duties as ambassador extraordinary and plenipotentiary to the Somali Democratic Republic on his transfer to other work.

BRAZIL NOT TO SUPPORT SANCTIONS AGAINST LIBYA

LD100836 Moscow TASS in English 0747 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] Brasilia, January 10 TASS -- Brazil is not going to join in the U.S. economic sanctions against Libya, an official spokesman for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Brazil has said here. He has stressed that at present relations between Brazil and Libya are developing normally both in the political and commercial spheres.

U.S. GUNBOAT FIRE AT SALVADORAN REBELS NOTED

LD100727 Moscow TASS in English 0715 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] Havana, January 10 TASS-- U.S. naval forces have committed an act of outright armed interference into the civil war in El Salvador. As was reported by the insurgents' radio station Venceremos, an American warship, coursing in the Gulf of Fonseca, along the Pacific Coast of EL Salvador, fired from its guns on units of the Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front. The American gunboat opened fire on guerrillas at a time when they forced to flee a battalion of Salvadorean punitive troops, trained by Americans, in the area of La Ventana Volcano (Usulutan Department).

CULTURAL, SCIENTIFIC PROGRAM SIGNED WITH BOLIVIA

LD101325 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0825 GMT 10 Jan 86

[Text] La Paz, 9 Jan (TASS) -- A ceremony to sign a program for cultural and scientific exchanges between the USSR and Bolivia for 1986-87 took place here.

Gaston Araoz Levy, Bolivian minister of foreign affairs, who signed the document for Bolivia, stated that a great practical step has been made toward strengthening relations of friendship and cooperation between the USSR and Bolivia which are characterized by total mutual understanding and trust. This program has enormous significance for Bolivia, the minister said, as it provides an opportunity for getting to know the USSR, its achievements in various spheres of the economy, science and technology, and culture and art. G. Araoz valued highly the USSR's readiness to share its very rich experience in these spheres with Bolivia.

The document in particular proposes cooperation in the sphere of astronomical research, an exchange of scientific delegations, of scientific information, and the development of ties between higher educational institutions. The point on the training of Bolivian national cadres in the USSR was particularly singled out.

In the sphere of culture and art both sides will promote tours in their countries by artistic collectives, artistic groups, and soloists. Great significance is also given by the program to developing ties in the sphere of cinema and the mass media.